

Official Gazette



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

EDITED AT THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, UNDER COMMONWEALTH ACT NO. 638
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, MANILA POST OFFICE, DECEMBER 26, 1905

Vol. 71

MANILA, PHILIPPINES, MAY 19, 1975

No. 20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	Page
PRESIDENTIAL ORDERS, PROCLAMATIONS, DECREES, INSTRUCTIONS, ETC.	
Presidential Decree No. 684, strengthening and defining the role of the Barangay Youth in every Barangay	2869
Presidential Decree No. 685, authorizing government representation in the Confederation of Philippine Exporters, Inc., extending the use of government facilities to said confederation, providing assistance for project implementation, and for other purposes	2870
Presidential Decree No. 686, amending Presidential Decree No. 659, entitled "Penalizing the Illegal Trading and the Exportation of Philippine Sugar" by inserting between sections five and six thereof a new section to be known as section five-A	2873
Presidential Decree No. 687, further amending the textbook law, Act 2957 as amended, providing the guidelines in the selection, approval, pricing and distribution of suitable textbooks for use in public elementary and secondary schools and for other purposes	2874
HISTORICAL PAPERS AND DOCUMENTS	
Speech of President Marcos during the observance of Labor Day, Maharlika Hall, Malacañang, May 1, 1975	2878
Speech of President Marcos during the observance of Corregidor Day, Corregidor, May 6, 1975	2892
DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT	
Davao Free Workers Front and/or Vicente R. Villarin, et al., vs. Court of Industrial Relations, 7-Up Bottling Company of the Philippines and/or Santiago Syjuco, Jr., 7-Up Bottling Company of the Philippines (Davao Branch) and/or Guillermo S. Sanchez, et al.,	2899
Philippine Virginia Tobacco Administration (PVTa), vs. Hon. Walfrido de los Angeles as Judge of the Court of First Instance of Rizal, Quezon City (Branch IV) and Abra Agricultural Assn., Bangued, Abra	2919
DECISIONS OF THE COURT OF APPEALS	
Bella Rita Yan, vs. Jose-Liwanag Liwag, et al.,	2925
The People of the Philippines, vs. Chu Tiong alias Te Liong	2934
Pangasinan Transportation Co., Inc., (Pantranco) vs. Filemon Cajator, et al., ..	2940
DEPARTMENT, BUREAU AND OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS AND REGULATIONS	
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—	
Professional Regulation Commission Board of Chemistry	
Resolution No. 10, series of 1975	2953
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—	
Opinion No. 46, s. 1975	2954
Opinion No. 47, s. 1975	2954
Opinion No. 48, s. 1975	2954
LAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION—	
Administrative Order No. 1, series of 1975	2956
Kautusang Pampangasiwaan Bilang I, serye ng 1975	2958
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH—	
Administrative Order No. 242, series of 1975	2961
CENTRAL BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES—	
Memorandum to Authorized Agent Banks	2962
Circular-Letter, April 28, 1975	2962
Memorandum to Authorized Agent Banks and Authorized Security Dealers	2963

	Page		Page
LEGAL AND OFFICIAL NOTICES		<i>Second Publication</i>	
<i>First Publication</i>		Court of First Instance	2987
Court of First Instance	2965	Land Registration Commission	2995
Land Registration Commission	2969	Bureau of Lands	3026
Batangas City	2984	Board of Investments	3027
Board of Investments	2985	PRICE LIST	3033
		THE OFFICIAL GAZETTE	back cover

**MGA KAUTUSANG TAGAPAGPAGANAP, PAHAYAG AT
KAUTUSANG PANGPANGASIWAAN**

(EXECUTIVE ORDERS, PROCLAMATIONS AND
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS)

MALACAÑANG

RESIDENCE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES
MANILA

PRESIDENTIAL DECREE No. 684

**STRENGTHENING AND DEFINING THE ROLE OF
THE BARANGAY YOUTH IN EVERY BARAN-
GAY.**

WHEREAS, during the referendum of February 27, 1975, the youth throughout the land has cogently displayed their zeal and capability to, as they did actually, participate in the ventilation of vital issues, both local and national, affecting their welfare and the future of this country;

WHEREAS, it has been noted that the present setup of the barangays under enabling Acts and/or Decrees, has proved, to a great extent, inadequate to assign to the youth of each and every barangay a definite role as well as afford them a medium to effectively express their views and opinions on issues of transcendental significance;

WHEREAS, such barangay youth, if afforded each and every opportunity for expression, would tremendously contribute toward an expeditious and clear ascertainment of the actual, genuine, legitimate and valid expression of the will of the people; and

WHEREAS, it would only be by giving them a definite role and affording them ample opportunity to express their views that a complete cross-section of the will of the populace could be accurately determined thereby providing a more democratic and popular basis for legislation and/or other governmental operations;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, FERDINAND E. MARCOS, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers in me vested by the Constitution, do hereby decree as part of the law of the land, the following:

SECTION 1. There shall be in every barangay throughout the land a barangay youth organization to be known as "Kabataang Barangay" composed of all the residents therein who are less than eighteen years of age.

SEC. 2. The affairs of said barangay youth organization shall be administered by a barangay youth chairman, together with six (6) barangay youth leaders, all of whom shall be at least fifteen years of age or over but less than eighteen and actual residents of the particular barangay.

They shall be chosen by the barangay youth assembly from among its members at a meeting called for the purpose.

SEC. 3. The barangay youth chairman shall be an *ex-officio* member of the barangay council of the particular barangay and, in such capacity, shall be the chairman of the Committee on Sports and Recreation activities of the barangay council. As an *ex-officio* member of the barangay council, he shall exercise the same powers and discharge the same functions as a regular barangay councilman.

SEC. 4. The barangay youth assembly shall be composed of the residents of the barangay who are at least fifteen years of age or over but less than eighteen and who are registered in the barangay list contemplated by Section Four of Presidential Decree Numbered Two Hundred and Ten dated June eight, nineteen hundred and seventy-three.

SEC. 5. The barangay captain of the particular barangay shall have general supervision over the the affairs of the barangay youth organization (Kabataang Barangay).

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Local Government and Community Development shall promulgate such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary to effectively implement the provisions of this Decree. ✎

SEC. 7. All provisions of laws, orders and decrees as well as rules and regulations inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed and/or modified accordingly.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this Decree, however, shall be construed as depriving the barangay youth of any and all rights, duties and responsibilities, vested or imposed upon them, under existing laws.

SEC. 9. This Decree shall take effect immediately.

Done in the City of Manila, this 15th day of April, in the year of Our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-Five.

(Sgd.) FERDINAND E. MARCOS

President

Republic of the Philippines

By the President:

(Sgd.) ALEJANDRO MELCHOR

Executive Secretary

MALACAÑANG

RESIDENCE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

MANILA

PRESIDENTIAL DECREE No. 685

AUTHORIZING GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATION
IN THE CONFEDERATION OF PHILIPPINE EX-

PORTERS, INC., EXTENDING THE USE OF GOVERNMENT FACILITIES TO SAID CONFEDERATION, PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

WHEREAS, the Confederation of Philippine Exporters, Inc., a non-stock, non-profit association of individuals, corporations, associations, partnerships, cooperatives and other institutions engaged in the export business or in servicing or financing of exports, is the only voluntary organization in the Philippines which integrates the private sector into a single corporate body in order to perform the vital function of assisting the Government in the development, promotion and expansion of the country's export trade;

WHEREAS, in order to assist the Confederation of Philippine Exporters, Inc. in accomplishing its important role, it is necessary for the government to recognize it as a private entity dedicated to a public purpose, and to extend every possible assistance to insure its success.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, FERDINAND E. MARCOS, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by the Constitution, do hereby order and decree, as part of the laws of the land, the following:

SECTION 1. *Declaration of Policy.* It is hereby declared the policy of the State to actively encourage the participation of the private sector in the development, promotion and expansion of the Philippine export trade.

SEC. 2. *Objectives.* The Confederation of Philippine Exporters, Inc., hereinafter referred to as COPE, shall have the following objectives:

- 1) To help promote and expand the export trade of the Philippines;
- 2) To provide a forum for all persons, associations, and other institutions concerned with the export trade for the purpose of recommending ways and means to effectively improve expand Philippine exports in particular, and promote the public interest in general;
- 3) To promote greater cooperation and coordination between exporters and the government agencies concerned;
- 4) To conduct studies pertinent to exports and to collate these data for the information of, and dissemination to, the members, and the public;
- 5) To support the adoption of internationally accepted quality standards and to encourage the observance of fair trade practices;
- 6) To actively participate whenever authorized to do so, in the formulation and implementation of an integrated national export promotion program;
- 7) To promote a spirit of service, mutual cooperation, efficiency and goodwill among its members;

- 8) To assist the government and perform such functions as may be delegated to it in matters concerning foreign trade; and
- 9) To organize private trade missions to foreign countries to promote Philippine exports and to represent the exporters in all government-sponsored trade missions to develop foreign markets for Philippine export products; and
- 10) To provide and maintain such other services as may be necessary to facilitate the development of exports.

SEC. 3. *Government Representation.*—The representatives of the National Economic and Development Authority, Department of Trade, Finance, Foreign Affairs, Industry, Agriculture, Natural Resources, National Defense, Public Information, and Tourism, Board of Investment, Central Bank of the Philippines, Development Bank of the Philippines, Philippine National Bank, and all other agencies involved in the formulations and implementation of trading and export policies are hereby authorized to sit in the Board of Trustees of the COPE with all the rights and prerogatives of regular members.

SEC. 4. *Composition of the COPE Board of Trustees.*—The COPE Board of Trustees is authorized to have twenty-five (25) members of which fourteen (14) members shall be elected from the private sector representing the various export industry groupings and the remaining eleven (11) members shall be elected from the agencies of the Government concerned with the country's foreign trade.

SEC. 5. *Donations and Grants.*—The COPE may receive such donations, bequests and grants from whatever sources, domestic or foreign to finance its operations. Such donations, bequests and grants shall be deductible in full from gross income and shall be exempt from donors or estate taxes.

SEC. 6. *Government Assistance.*—All government offices, agencies or instrumentalities, including government-owned or controlled corporation, which are directly or indirectly concerned in the implementation of export promotion projects of the Government are hereby authorized to extend such assistance to COPE as may be necessary for projects that will redound to the benefit of the national economy.

SEC 7. *Repealing Clause.*—Any provisions of existing general or special laws inconsistent with the provisions of this Decree shall be deemed modified, amended or repealed accordingly.

SEC. 8. *Effectivity.*—This Decree shall take effect immediately.

Done in the City of Manila, this 15th day of April,
in the year of Our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-
five.

(Sgd.) FERDINAND E. MARCOS
President
Republic of the Philippines

By the President:

(Sgd.) ALEJANDRO MELCHOR
Executive Secretary

MALACAÑANG
RESIDENCE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES
MANILA

PRESIDENTIAL DECREE No. 686

AMENDING PRESIDENTIAL DECREE NO. 659, EN-
TITLED "PENALIZING THE ILLEGAL TRADING
AND THE EXPORTATION OF PHILIPPINE SU-
GAR" BY INSERTING BETWEEN SECTIONS
FIVE AND SIX THEREOF A NEW SECTION TO
BE KNOWN AS SECTION FIVE-A.

WHEREAS, in order to implement fully the provisions
of Presidential Decree No. 659, entitled "Penalizing the
Illegal Trading and the Illegal Exportation of Philippine
Sugar", it is necessary that a government agency be
authorized to promulgate rules and regulations that would
ensure the effectiveness of said Decree to the smallest
details and as the occasion may require from time to
time; and

WHEREAS, it may be necessary to require the traders
of sugar, especially the big ones, to submit periodic reports
as to the quantities of sugar being stored and/or traded
by them in order to enable the Government to monitor
the movements of sugar all over the country;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, FERDINAND E. MARCOS, President
of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me
by the Constitution, do hereby decree and order:

SECTION 1. Presidential Decree No. 659 is hereby amend-
ed by inserting between sections five and six thereof, a
new section to be known as section five-A, which shall
read as follows:

"SEC. 5-A. The Secretary of National Defense shall pro-
mulgate rules and regulations implementing the provisions of
this Decree and shall, if necessary, require all sugar prod-
ucers, millers, warehousemen, traders and other persons hand-
ling stocks of sugar to submit monthly or weekly reports
under oath on the sugar actually being handled and traded
by them. Any person who willfully violates such rules and
regulations and/or who willfully makes false statements in

the said reports shall be liable to the penalty provided in Sec. 3(a) of this Decree."

SEC. 2. All laws, executive orders, instructions, rules and regulations inconsistent with these provisions are hereby repealed or amended accordingly.

SEC. 3. This Decree shall take effect immediately.

Done in the City of Manila, this 17th day of April, in the year of Our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-five.

(Sgd.) FERDINAND E. MARCOS
President of the Philippines

By the President:

(Sgd.) ALEJANDRO MELCHOR
Executive Secretary

MALACAÑANG
RESIDENCE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES
MANILA

PRESIDENTIAL DECREE No. 687

FURTHER AMENDING THE TEXTBOOK LAW, ACT 2957 AS AMENDED, PROVIDING THE GUIDELINES IN THE SELECTION, APPROVAL, PRICING AND DISTRIBUTION OF SUITABLE TEXTBOOKS FOR USE IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

WHEREAS, the Board on Textbooks performs the vital function of selection and approval of textbooks for use in all public elementary and secondary schools, including the approval of textbooks used in private elementary and secondary schools;

WHEREAS, in order to perform this function effectively and properly, it is necessary that the Board be composed of persons with the highest competence, dedication and integrity, with authority to avail of such technical assistance as may be necessary to insure proper evaluation of manuscripts and the selection and adoption of quality textbooks for use in the public schools;

WHEREAS, the objective of selection and production of quality textbooks can be achieved by allowing open and free competition in the submission of manuscripts by qualified writers and the production thereof by duly registered bona-fide publishers, encouraging at the same time the production of textbooks by competent research staffs in government-organized curriculum research and development centers;

WHEREAS, the assessment of production costs of any textbook adopted by the Board for the purpose of deter-

mining prices at which textbooks can be sold at the minimum cost requires the adoption of a scheme whereby a fair and just appraisal thereof can best arrived at;

WHEREAS, a degree of control in the actual procurement and allocation of textbooks needed in the field should be exercised by the Board to insure the equitable distribution thereof based on needs;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, FERDINAND E. MARCOS, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by the Constitution do hereby order and decree to be part of the laws of the land, the following:

SECTION 1. The Board on Textbooks created under the provision of Act 2957 as amended is hereby renamed the Textbook Board. The Board shall be composed of seven (7) members as follows: A Chairman and four (4) members appointed by the President upon recommendation of the Secretary of Education and Culture, the Director of Elementary Education and the Director of Secondary Education. The Chairman and the other four (4) members appointed by the President, one of whom shall represent the cultural minority, shall serve a term of three (3) years, except that of the four first appointed, two (2) shall serve of three (3) years and the other two (2) for a term of two (2) years. Any vacancy in the Board shall be filled by appointment by the President but the person so appointed shall serve only for the unexpired term. No person shall be appointed to the Board unless he is a citizen of the Philippines, with at least a master's degree or its equivalent in terms of professional experience, status and achievements.

SEC. 2. The Textbook Board shall have a Secretariat composed of personnel as are now provided under the Integrated Recorganization Plan.

SEC. 3. The Board may avail itself, at any given time, of such number of qualified personnel from the public or private sector to perform the function of appraisal of manuscripts submitted for evaluation and selection by authors or by duly registered book publishers. They shall be entitled to such honorarium for their services for such amount per title as may be determined by the Board.

SEC. 4. The Board shall determine and adopt its own guidelines or rules and regulations for their operational procedure. It shall adopt such policies as will insure a fair and objective appraisal of manuscripts submitted to it for evaluation, the criteria for the final selection and approval as textbooks and a policy on continuing evaluation of those approved and adopted by the Board. It shall likewise undertake studies from time to time on the textbook situation in the country, seek ways and means for their production at minimum cost, and adopt policy

guidelines in the allocation and distribution of textbooks in accordance with the procurement program of the Department of Education and Culture.

SEC. 5. The policy of free enterprise on the matter of allowing the submission of manuscripts by writers or duly registered publishers for possible selection and adoption as textbooks shall be without prejudice to the automatic adoption by the Board of any treatise, textbook or manual on the same subject prepared by agencies authorized by the government; Provided, however, that in the case of the latter, the printing or production thereof shall be farmed out to qualified textbook publishers or printers under such guidelines as may be prescribed by the Board.

SEC. 6. The manuscript thus selected and approved by the Board, in accordance with Sec. 5 hereof, shall be printed in such number of copies and under such guidelines as the Board may direct, such copies to be used for determining the reasonable price at which the book shall be purchased by the government, provisions of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. For this purpose, there shall be created by the Secretary of Education and Culture, a Price Committee consisting of three (3) members, one Board member representing the Board as Chairman, one representing the Philippine Educational Publishers Association and one representing the Bureau of Printing. The Committee shall hold its meetings on the date set by the Board which shall be in the nature of a public hearing, allowing expert testimony therein in order to arrive at an acceptable estimate of production cost for any given textbook. The determination of the "mark-up" in percent over the production cost for any textbook to insure a reasonable profit for publishers and at the same time insuring the minimum procurement cost for the government shall be determined by the Board.

SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful for the Board to consider for adoption any treatise textbook or manuscript in whose authorship, editorship or preparation a member of the Board may have direct or indirect interest. It shall, likewise, be unlawful for any member of the Board during the period of his incumbency to own directly or indirectly any interest whatsoever in any firm, partnership or corporation on publishing or dealing in school textbooks.

SEC. 8. Except in exceptional cases as may be determined by the Board, the textbooks selected and approved shall be used for a period of at least six (6) years from the date of their adoption. Private schools recognized or authorized by the Government shall, as much as possible, use textbooks approved by the Board. The Board shall have the power to prohibit the use of any textbook in

private schools other than those approved by the Board, which it may find to be against the law or offensive to the dignity and honor of the Government and people of the Philippines or which it may find to be against the general policies of the government or which it may find as pedagogically unsuitable.

SEC. 9. The Board shall, as a matter of policy encourage the writing of textbooks for Philippine schools by Filipino authors using such Philippine sources of subject material as will develop in pupils and students a deeper sense of nationalism, respect for Philippine institutions and appreciation of our cultural heritage.

SEC. 10. For administrative purposes, the Textbook Board shall be directly under the Office of the Secretary of Education and Culture. The Chairman of the Board shall have authority, with the approval of the Department Head, to obtain the technical assistance of such personnel from any department, bureau or office of the government which may be considered necessary for the proper performance of its duties, with compensation for their services as may be determined by the Board.

SEC. 11. Members of the Board shall be entitled to an allowance of One-Hundred (P100.00) Pesos per meeting actually attended but not exceeding Four Hundred (P400.00) Pesos a month, exclusive of reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred in attendance of meetings and other official business authorized by resolution of the Board.

SEC. 12. The sum of One Hundred Thousand (P100,000.00) Pesos or so much thereof as may be necessary shall, in addition to the regular annual appropriations for the operation and maintenance of the Textbook Board, be appropriated annually from funds of the National Treasury not otherwise appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Decree.

SEC. 13. All laws, decrees, executive orders or existing rules and regulations contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of this Decree are hereby repealed, amended or modified accordingly.

SEC. 14. The Decree shall take effect immediately.

Done in the City of Manila, this 22nd day of April, in the year of Our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-five.

(Sgd.) FERDINAND E. MARCOS

President

Republic of the Philippines

By the President:

(Sgd.) ALEJANDRO MELCHOR

Executive Secretary

MGA KASULATAN AT DOKUMENTONG PANCKASAYSAYAN

(HISTORICAL PAPERS AND DOCUMENTS)

(SPEECH OF PRESIDENT MARCOS DURING THE OBSERVANCE OF
LABOR DAY, MAHARLIKA HALL, MALACANANG, MAY 1, 1975)

I understand that we have here the representatives of the labor movements of the United States—the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I also wish to make special mention that we have here with us the representatives of trade unions of Germany and Japan.

I can only see one or two representatives from other foreign labor movements.

I would like to ask Mr. Donald Bergstrom, resident representative of the United Nations Development Programme in the Philippines, to stand up. Let's give him a hand, and the labor attache of the US embassy—Mr. Eiler Cook.

May I ask if there are any other members of the diplomatic corps who are here. I don't see any others. May I then request the representatives of the AFL and CIO to please stand up. They are Mr. Jack Goodwin and Mr. Kenneth Hutcheson. For the trade union in Germany, we have here Mr. Alfons Lappas, and Mr. Klaus Pretzer, head of the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, a German Foundation in the Philippines. For the trade union in Japan, we have Mr. Sato.

I understand that the International Labor Organization is also represented here and its delegates are Mr. Leslie Cairns and Mr. Josef Mayors. Will you please stand up?

Palakpakan ninyo sila sapagka't sila ang tumutulong sa atin, sa ating ginagawa. Tunay na tulong naman iyan. Hindi iyong tulong na pabalat-bunga o tulong na bumabalik din at pansarili. Mga dating gawa iyan ng mga nakaraang araw. Binabati ko rin ang Unang Ginang, na bagaman huli kong binanggit ay sapagka't una siya sa aking puso.

Alam ninyo, mga kasama, marahil ay naghihintay ang mga inanyayahan namin sa misa at pananghalian. Tila yata si Arsobispo Jaime L. Sin ang magmimisa ngayon. Aywan ko lang kung sino ang magmimisa. Pero kung si Arsobispo Sin, naku, lalong magagalit sa atin ang Arso-bispo niyan. Pinaghintay ko, nguni't alam naman niya na kapag ang ating mga manggagawa ang nag-aanyaya sa inyong abang lingkod at sa Unang Ginang, walang hindi.

Itong araw na ito ay dapat namang hindi lamang ukol sa Araw ng Paggawa.

Ewan ko nga ba kung bakit napatapat sa Labor Day. Itong magkasabay na araw tayo nagdiriwang ng dalawang napakahalagang bagay. Labor Day. Hindi naman natin maiiwasan ang Araw ng Paggawa. Tayo'y nangingilin. Tila iba ang iniisip ninyo. Sabi ko nga kay Imelda kanina nang makita ko ang programa magkasama pala kami, gumising-gising ka na at may programa palang magkasama tayo. Ang sagot niya: Hindi ba ito ay araw natin? E, araw nga natin, araw ng mga kapus-palad na gaya natin. Kaya kailangan ay paroonan din natin sila sapagka't alam naman ng lahat, wika ko na noong ako ay naghihirap pa, at naghahanap ng katulong sa ating ginagawa hindi lamang sa Bagong Lipunan, kung hindi sa mga halalang nakaraan, sino ang unang tumangkilik kay Marcos? Walang iba kung hindi ang lahat ng mga manggagawa na nagkabuklod-buklod upang tumulong.

Kaya't tuwing makikita ko nga iyang inyong diwa para sa araw na ito, unity in crisis, naaalala ko na naman noong mga nakaraang araw na ang ating mga mamamayan ay nagkahiwa-hiwalay at nagkaaway-away. Nakita ko rito si Luis Taruc kanina. Iyang si Luis Taruc noong panahon ng digmaang pandaigdig, kasama natin iyan. Lumalaban sa mga lumusob sa ating bansa. Pagkatapos nagkahiwalay nang kaunti. Hindi nagkaunawaan at pagkatapos ay nagkalaban uli. Nguni't ngayon ay nagkakasama na. Nang nagtatalumpati ang ating mga lider sila Gerry Montemayor. Kagaya ni Gerry, ano ba naman ang ginagawa ni Gerry ngayon. Siya ay dean noong araw ng College of Law sa unibersidad. Dean ng College of Law, naging peasant leader.

Kanya't tinitingnan ko ang mga labor leaders dito kanina kung sino talaga ang tunay na lider-manggagawa, nakikita ko nga sa lahat ng mukha. Ang lahat ng talagang nagpakahirap, gaya si Bert Oca naririto, si Legayada. Nang ako'y practicing attorney pa iyong hanapbuhay ang mag-abogado, katulong nila akong nagtatayo ng unyon doon sa Philippine Air Lines, gobyerno pa noong araw ang may-ari ng PAL. Nilabanan pati natin ang gobyerno noon.

May ibang labor union diyan which I helped organize when I was a lawyer and when I was in Congress. Itong sila Bert Oca, kasama-sama ko iyan sa lahat ng mga paghihirap. Ito namang nagbigay sa akin ng resolusyong tungkol sa military bases, mutual defense, saka security arrangement with the United States, kasama kong sundalo iyang si Quito Mendoza. Aywan ko kung papaano napasok sa labor union itong isang ito, e pareho kong opisyal ito sa

USAFFE. We were officers in the USAFFE and later on, in the underground movement. He was operating in the South.

I was touched by the paradox of this entire situation. Here are two officers of the United States Armed Forces in the Far East, and of the underground of the Philippines fighting together with American comrades, and others—Australian comrades, New Zealanders and others, who came here during liberation and now both of them are asking to reassess the military agreements with the United States. Alam ko ang iniisip ni Quito. Wika niya: “Sipain na natin iyan.”

At sa tulong ng kilusang paggawa, ilan ba ang bilang ng mga manggagawa dito sa Pilipinas? Labing-apat na milyon. There are 14 million members of the labor force in the Philippines, six million of which are in the modern wage system, while eight million are more or less self-employed, the old traditional ways of earning a living, the farmers, fishermen and the like. How many members are there in the labor unions? The secretary assures me that there are now one million and a half. Eh ‘ika ko, ilan ang lider manggagawa diyan sa isa at kalahating milyon? Baka wika ko ay isang milyon ang lider diyan. Hindi naman daw.

Ang ibig kong sabihin ay noong araw hindi ba nagkakaroon ng mga “union raiding” na kung anu-ano at away? Aabot sa akin iyong mga gulo. Tatanungin ko si Blas: “Ano na naman iyang gulo? Bakit na naman nagkaroon ng strike? Saan nanggaling? Ano ang dahilan? May union raid daw. Anong raid, anong ibig sabihin niyang union raid? Iyan ba’y talagang naglalaban? Nag-aagawan lang daw. Anong pinag-aagawan? Alam na ninyo ang pinag-aagawan. Nguni’t ngayon ay wala na ito.

Those are the things that I remember when I see your theme, “Unity in Crisis.”

Sa araw na ito ay ating pinararangalan ang lahat ng manggagawa, 14 milyong manggagawa sa buong Pilipinas. Kasama na ryan ang mga nasa wage system na anim na milyon, ang mga magbubukid, ang mga mangingisda, ang mga manggagawa sa mga pabrika, sa bahay-kalakal, mga empleado sa bahay at mga tanggapan. Nabanggit ko ang mga magbubukid, mangingisda, naririto rin pati ang Agrarian Reform secretary si Conrado Estrella, although we have always set a day to celebrate the liberation of the tenants and the small farmers from the bondage of the soil that was their legacy for centuries past. It is usually celebrated on October 21, although the proclamation was signed on the 27th of September, within a week after I

proclaimed martial law and the beginning of a new society. However, I have directed that on May 7, we will celebrate the day of Land Reform, meaning the transfer of land from the landowners to the tenants. That's why on May 7, he will have his day here too.

Kaya siguro nanonood at tinitingnan kung ano ang mangyayari sa Labor Day sapagka't wika niya sa akin nang biruin ko siya sa isang tripartite meeting natin dito noong Lunes, sabi ko, "bakit ikaw walang makuhang taong mga kasama mo sa agrarian?" "Aba hindi po, mas marami dito." "Puputok ang Maharlika kapag kami ang pupunta rito."

And so, we will celebrate land reform. But when we speak of labor, we include the labor force in the farm. Itong aking taos pusong pagbati sa lahat ng mga manggagawa buhat sa Maynila hanggang sa kasuluk-sulukan sa pinakamalalayong mga barangay sa buong Pilipinas.

Katulad ng lahat ng mag-asawa, lahat ng araw ang laman ng aking isip at puso ay si Imelda lamang. Ang ibig kong sabihin, kagaya ng mag-asawa ganoon din ang pagdiriwang ng Labor Day.

We observe Labor Day one day of the year but this doesn't mean you don't observe it every day of the year. Iyan ang ibig kong sabihin. Kagaya ng pag-ibig iyan. Natatawa itong si Imelda. Buhat pa kaninang umaga ay binibiro ko na. Wika ko, "Alam mo, dalampu at isang taon na tayo ngayon. Kawawa ka naman. Sukat kang mabilanggo ng dalawampu't isang taon. Alam mo ang 21 ay triple 7 iyan. Kaya mahalagang taon iyan."

Sa taong ito ay mag-iiba ang larawan ng Pilipinas. Mag-iiba ang mga mangyayari rito sa ating parte ng daigdig. Nabanggit ko na sa kanya ito noong Enero. Little did I imagine that what I told her on New Year of 1974 would be soon implemented by the turn of events in this part of the world. Under the law, as I told Imelda, 21 is the age of majority. Twenty-one is the age when you can give consent for anything. Twenty-one years is the year we mark on our wedding day.

Labor, however, marks its continued march towards progress, not only the 21st year but many, many years, for labor traces its pains, its sacrifices all the way back sapagka't nang itinatag natin ang isang Bagong Lipunan, ating patitindigin ang isang bagong Pilipino. Sa bagong Pilipinong iyan manggagaling ang karamihan sa ating mga manggagawa.

Hindi nga ba parati natin sinasabi bagong Pilipino. What do we mean by that? Do we mean that we discredit our forefathers, disdain them, and are ashamed of them? Sila

nga ba ay napakasamang mga tao na ayaw na natin gayahin ang kanilang mga ugali? Hindi. Bumalik tayo kay Rizal. We go back to Rizal and his writings about the Filipino. Didn't he himself say that the Filipinos had grown lazy for there was no incentive to encourage them for industry and self-reliance. The colonial masters had put a penalty on the affluent or those who had acquired any station in life. They were immediately put under suspicion.

You go down to the dungeons of Fort Santiago. You, who were in Fort Santiago with me, you who have seen the dungeon there where the water reaches up to your waistline at low tide and as high as your breast or over your head at high tide, know what that dungeon contained during the times when there was punishment there. Ang mga mayayaman na Pilipino kung hindi inililipat sa simbahan. Bakit ba nasabi ang simbahan? Sapagka't mga pari ang namumuno ng pamahalaan. Kung hindi ililipat ang ari-arian sa mga Kastila ay ipinapasok doon sa balon at pinababayaang malunod. Kaya't there was no incentive for work. But now we create a new man with the New Society, and this is what I came to talk about. Nasabi nga natin nagtatatag ang Bagong Lipunan.

What can the President do? What can the leaders of the government do, the members of the Cabinet, the National Economic and Development Authority, the leaders of the barangays and all the others? We can merely set the climate and the theme. But the truth about it is that the New Society cannot be established by anyone except by you—the laboring group and the labor force that constitute the productive and energetic agent of our society.

That is why, today, I call upon everyone in the labor force to participate in this effort. I keep on repeating this and I may start to sound common place, repetitious, redundant, but I hear the resolutions that were read here, especially the resolution read by Gerry, the manifesto and the speech of Bert Oca and of Mr. Legayado and also that of Gat. You are asking for the participation of labor in the decisions of the government in the higher councils of government.

Now let me tell you that if there is anything which we consider the most important factor in decision-making in the government, it is labor. If any decision is prejudicial to labor and to the ordinary working man in the country, then that decision must be held. This has always been my guidelines. If there is anyone who represents labor in government today with the force and strength of leadership, it is the President of the Republic of the Philippines.

Palakpak kayo nang palakpak nguni't hindi ninyo nauunawaan, even our own democratic revolution, what do we call it, revolution of the poor. Ayan katakut-takot na pamimintas na naman ang ginagawa sa akin sapagka't inagaw ko raw ang Meralco at sinasarili raw natin. Alam naman ninyo ang dahilan kaya natin kinuha ang Meralco. Unang-una matitigil na sana iyan sapagka't napakaraming utang, kinaltasan nang kinaltasan. Alam na ninyo kung sino ang may-ari? Nagkaipun-ipon ang mga utang niyan kaya't ang gobyerno ay pumasok at hiningi sa mga may-ari na kung maaari ay ibigay na. Hiningi natin sa kanila ang Meralco at iyan ay napakalaking bagay. Diyan galing ang lahat ng ilaw at lakas ng elektrisidad na ginagamit sa industriya at sa lahat ng mga bagay. Iyan ang nagpapatakbo ng ating bansa. Kaya, wika ko, hindi maaaring sariling iyan ng iisang tao, iisang pamilya. Ang aking sinikap kung maaari ay ilipat sa lahat ng ating mga kapuspalad. Ang aking hinihingi at ang aking panaginip ang mga malalaking pabrikang iyan na pinanggagalingan ng kayamanan ay hindi pag-aari ng iisang tao lamang o isang pamilya lamang kung hindi pag-aari ng karamihan lalo na ang mga kapuspalad at walang mga sariling ari-arian.

Kaya't ang aking bilin sa kanila kung maaari, tutulungan namin ang Meralco nguni't the shares of stock of Meralco must be transferred to the poorer consumers of Meralco. I make this announcement sapagka't nabasa ko na naman doon sa isang pahayagan nila kung anong mga peryodiko, inagaw daw ni Marcos. Bakit ko aagawin ang sakit ng ulong iyan? At saka Presidente ako, mang-aagaw pa ako? Napakahirap naman niyan. Ang Presidente ay hindi nang-aagaw kung talagang ibig pumasok sa anumang bagay, bibilhin lamang tapos na iyan. Nguni't ang ating nakikita rito, mga kaibigan, sa Pilipinas ngayon, hindi ba ang pinanggagalingan ng lahat ng ating sakit sa ating lipunan ay ang kayamanan ng ilang tao lamang. Ilang tao lamang ang may-ari niyan pagkatapos ginagamit iyan upang ipitin ang mga pangkaraniwang Pilipino. Kaya't nakikita ninyo ang Planters Product, isang fertilizer plant, sino lamang ang mga may-ari niyan?

Ang usapan namin ni G. Alfredo Montelibano ay gawin na natin ang kailangan sapagka't ang Fertilizer Plant ay dapat maging ari ng mga mahihirap na magbubukid. Ito ay dalawang ehemplo lang, Meralco at saka Planters Products. Meralco para sa industrial consumers dito sa Maynila, at ang Fertilizer Plant para sa ating mga magbubukid.

In accordance with that agreement, Mr. Montelibano and all the others worked at a scheme under which the ownership of Planters Products will now be transferred to the farmers of the Philippines and not only to a few.

Why do I cite these two examples? I have asked the Meralco Foundation that Meralco should be owned by the consumers here in Manila, not by a single family or person, but to be owned by the consumer, sapagka't ang mga consumers ay tayong mga manggagawa ang nagbabayad diyan, nagpapalaki, nagpapalago, eh bakit tayo ngayon ang kakaltasan at pahhirapan? Dapat niyan kung maaari sapagka't diyan galing lahat ang kailangan, hindi masarili iyan ng ilang tao lamang. At the point of crisis, suddenly this thing, since it's under the control of one man, stops; we will be in trouble. The same thing with fertilizers. This is one of the reasons why the Rice and Corn Administration in the past was nationalized because it was a critical problem.

But anyway, these are just two examples of the revolution of the poor and the democratization of wealth which we are now engaged. Pinagkakamalian, we are being criticized. But let me now announce in the presence of all the laboring elements of our country over the radio and through television, that whatever anyone says, we will proceed with it—revolution of the poor and the democratization of wealth in the Philippines.

And let no man seek to obstruct this. I agree with Gerry Montemayor and the Manifesto of Labor. There are still some of our people, some capitalists, some managers who do not identify themselves yet with labor. And I would like to warn them that the patience not only of the laboring class but also of the political leadership is getting short from watching the attitude of some of the members of both management and the affluent as well as those who are in labor themselves.

We are getting impatient and I would like to warn everyone. If necessary, I will utilize the powers of the presidency in order to accelerate the democratic revolution of the Philippines, including the democratization of wealth. Of course, I hasten to add, to clarify this with the statement that this does not mean we are going to take over property. Aagawin, pagkatapos ay ipamimigay sa ating mga mahihirap. No. We are a free enterprise society. We leave to the private sector the principal initiative for progress. We believe in the initiative of the individual, especially the private individual. The government will set the tone. The government will establish the climate but it will leave to the private sector the principal effort for progress.

I would like to congratulate the management, well, the tripartite congress for the various resolutions that have come out of that congress. One of the lessons that we see in these present-day crises confronting both developed and

undeveloped countries is that no country, no matter how powerful, can now afford to be disunited. I will not go any further, but you look at the most powerful nations in the world. You look at how political institutions are now suffering from the vicissitudes of current events, how an officer is questioned by another in exercising his power, resulting in division and in impotence to meet a crisis.

I congratulate the laboring class, the movement of labor, in bringing about unity. I congratulate the management groups in agreeing to sit down with labor and government. I would like to see more of this.

Today we are met with two principal crises. It is said that no matter how much you increase the salaries and wages of employes and laborers, all these increases in wages will be for naught if inflation goes uncontrolled. Ano ang ibig sabihin niyan? Maski na taasan mo nang taasan ang sahod ng ating mga manggagawa kung ang presyo ng mga binibili, mga kalakal, mga kailangan sa ating buhay ay pataas nang pataas, walang kabuluhan ang pagtataas ng sahod ng ating mga manggagawa. Alam naman ninyo iyan. Kaya ito ang nilulunasan ng ating pamahalaan, and that is why your government has attempted in every possible way, short of utilizing coercive measures, to maintain and bring down the prices of prime commodities in this country by encouraging production.

Alam naman ninyo, mga kaibigan, nang magsimula tayo, noong 1972 what was our growth of the gross national product and in 1973 it went up to 10 per cent. However, we met with the crisis of oil in 1973, then recession. But we still maintain our orientation to continue production, especially of food. Even the First Lady participated in this effort. Pinapunta ko doon sa ating mga kaibigan sa Middle East, sa Amerika, sa Europa. Napilitan akong ipadala siya sa ibang bansa sapagka't kailangan ng bansa. Pati si Secretary Carlos P. Romulo at lahat ng mga embahador. Sila ay sangayon na dapat isugo ang First Lady dahil iyon na nga na hindi lang sa matalino, mahusay makipag-usap at maganda. Ito ay sinasabi ko at hindi galing sa akin ito. Ito ang sabi nina Secretary Romulo at saka ng mga embahador. Wika nila, hindi tayo pinapansin doon sa mga usapan sa ibang bansa, ipadala nga natin ang First Lady, tingnan natin kung hindi malaki ang magawa niya. Tutoo nga. Ipinadala natin ang First Lady aba, ayaw nang pauwiin.

Kaya ko ipinadala ang First Lady sa Middle East na nga ay pagka't kung anu-ano ang mga istorya. Ito ay karugtong din ng ating unity in crisis sapagka't doon sa Mindanaw, Sulu, ipinipilit na lagi sa akin ng ating Armed Forces of the Philippines, "pasukin na po nating lahat iyan.

Ang dali nating matapos ang labanang iyan. Hayaan mo lamang kami at ipikit mo lang ang mata. Umalis ka nga at pumunta ka nga sa Amerika at huwag mo na kaming pansinin dito. Kami ang bahala. Bigyan mo kami ng tatlong buwan. Pero, wika ko, "ano ang gagawin ninyo?" Aba ay tatapusin na po namin iyan. Linisin na natin iyan. Madali po iyan kung iyan ang talagang sakit ng ulo. Sabi ko "tatapusin nga ninyo, pero, katakut-takot na dugo ang dadanak."

Ipalagay mong patayin natin lahat iyang ating mga kapatid sa Timog, iyan ay mga bagong saling-lahi, iyong ating susunod na mga lider. They constitute the leader class, the new leader class of our brothers in the South and you eliminate everyone. Who will be the leaders of that group when I also want to set up a new society, a new society in the South. Who will be the leaders? Papatayin nating lahat ang ating mga kapatid, hindi maaaring mangyari iyan. Kausapin natin. Ipakita ninyo na ang lakas ng ating mga Sandatahang Lakas ng Pilipinas ay may magagawang ibang paraan para masugpo ang gulo nang hindi dadanak ang dugo.

You show them the capability. Peru huwag ninyong uubusin ang mga taong iyan. Kakailanganin natin sila. Eh ano nga ang nangyari? Nang tumawag tayo ng peace conference doon sa Zamboanga, aba'y nagsidating na lahat ang mga bata. Ang nakita ko pa, mga dati kong kilala, mga dating kasama kong sundalo at mga anak ng mga dating kasamang sundalo, sapagka't ako'y laki sa Mindanaw, alam naman ninyo.

I grew partially in Davao. I knew Mindanao when it was a virgin territory, when there were still a lot of forbidden lands for Christians. You know that my father was there, and we pioneered there. We brought in the Christians into Mindanao and Sulu. And you know my brother fought in Sulu. That's why we know the territory. We have many friends in Mindanao and Sulu.

When I saw my old friends there, when we met with the leaders, when the principal leaders of Sulu asked to meet with me, I didn't realize that several of them were old friends of mine. They used *noms de guerre*. Iba't ibang pangalan ang ginagamit nila sa paglaban. Gaya nga nitong si *Maasbawang*, dati kong kasama iyan sa lahat ng lakaran. Eh siya pala ang pinakamatandang lider ng mga rebelde doon. Wika ko, ano ba ang ginagawa mo at nasa kabila ka'y ako'y narito at naghihirap. Aba'y wika niya, mangyari akala ko'y ipatatapos mo na kaming lahat. Eh, ang balita rito sapagka't ikaw ay Kristiyano, kami naman ay Muslim, kami ay ililigpit mo na. Aba wika ko, hindi

ko iniisip iyan. Bakit ka hindi sumulat sa akin? Bakit hindi nagpadala ng balita na ikaw pala ay tumakbo na doon sa bundok? Ano ang ginawa mo sa mga baril na ibinigay ko sa iyo, wika ko. Saan mo inilagay? Iyan ang ginamit namin laban sa iyo wika niya. Natigil ang labanan.

Mayroon pa ring mga konting gusot. Sapagka't mayroon namang iba riyan na hindi talagang ideologues kung sabihin, iyong mga lumalaban dahil sa pinaninindigan, kung hindi pansarili lang, iyong mga nagnanakaw. Marami riyan. Mayroon mga talagang nagdahilan na lamang na sumama sa mga rebelde at wika kami rebelde rin. Iyon pala'y buhat sapul ay magnanakaw at talagang walang ibang ginagawa kung hindi mangholdap lang. Iyan ang mga dapat iligpit.

Naaalala ninyo noong magmiting kami rito nakita ko ang mga bata. Ano, bakit kayo napasama rito? Aba'y sabi po sa amin ito'y talagang tapusan na. Dinala po kami roon kung saan-saan. Hindi ko na sasabihin ang bansa. Sinanay kami roon. Saan kayo nagsanay? Doon po sa ibang bansa. Apatnapu't limang mga opisyal, lider, mga bata at kita mong talagang lider, sinusunod ng mga Muslim at matatapang. At nang makausap ko, wika nila, na ngayon na nauunawaan na namin ay gusto namin kung maaari wika nila, sapagka't wala naman kaming hanapbuhay, pababalikin mo kami doon, eh ano ang gagawin namin doon? Magkakamot lang kami ng tiyan doon, pagtatawanan kami doon. Wika ko, hindi. Magtatag tayo, buuin natin ang isang brigada, one brigade of Muslim soldiers.

So I ordered the establishment of initially a battalion of Muslims. Nagkaisa. And I commissioned on the spot 45 officers, 45 officers of the Moro National Liberation Front, as officers in the Armed Forces of the Philippines.

Wika ko nga sa kanila, bakit hindi kayo nagtanong sa akin. Kung mayroong magrebelde tayong lahat huwag hiwa-hiwalay. Kung mayroon tayong lalabanan sabay-sabay tayo. Kung mayroon talagang mahigpit na masasakim na mga kalaban dito ay tayo ng lahat magpakamatay tayo alang-alang sa bansa. Ako ang inyong pinuno sa mga labanan na ganyan. Hindi ko pababayaan wika ko, na kayo'y pahihirapan o ililigpit dahil sa kayo ay Muslim.

Unity in crisis and we think of the laboring class again in Mindanao. Naroon kayong lahat mga labor leaders. You have your unions there, the free farmers are there. Gaya din doon sa Bukidnon noong araw, iyong free farmers umaangal. Aba'y pati iyong obispo roon ay akala kalaban niya ako. Wika ko, hindi ako kalaban niyan. Aba ka-

sama iyang free farmers na iyan. Kasama ko si Gerry. Parati kong kasama, eh bakit iyong kanyang tagasunod ay hindi natin tulungan.

Nawika ng mga free farmers, alisin po ninyo iyang provincial commander diyan sapagka't masyadong malupit. Aba'y inalis ko kaagad. Hindi lang inalis, pinaimbistigahan ko at nang makita kong totoo na mabigat ang kamay niya. Ganoon din, wika nila mayroon din sa First PC Zone nagpapahirap ng mga opisyal. Ngayon nasa Court Martial. Maski sino sa kanila, alam po naman ninyo, mga kaibigan, na hindi ko pababayaang hindi ko pahihintulutan maski sino man, maski gaano kapait sa akin na gawin ang hindi dapat gawin ng isang opisyal. Kaya't I think you remember the cases of Father Edicio dela Torre and Manuel Labos. They claimed that they were hit in the stomach when they were captured.

Wika noong opisyal "talagang sinuntok ko po sa tiyan sapagka't dinuduruan pa ako." Aba, wika ko'y hindi maaaring basta susuntokin mo, opisyal ka, de galon ka, pagkatapos manununtok ka nang walang sandata, ikaw ay may hawak na sandata." Wika niya, "Kung kailangan po na parusahan ako, ako po ay nahahanda. Iyan po ay ginawa ko sa ngalan ng ating Republika."

Naimbestigahan siya at naroon sa court martial. Ang kawawa naman diyan ay yaong mga sundalo. Sumunod lamang yaong mga sundalo sa bilin ng mga opisyal. Gapusin mo, wika. Ginapos nga. Napahirapan, nagkaroon ng mga sugat sa paa, sapagka't mahigpit ang tali, kaya ngayon court martial. Iyan ang ibig kong sabihin, na ano man ang pagmamalabis na gawa ng sino mang opisyal sa ating pamahalaan at sa ating mga Sandatahang Lakas ng Pilipinas, sabihin sa akin at gagawin ko ang nararapat. Kayo ang dapat na mata at dila ng ating Bagong Lipunan. Ano man ang makikita ninyong pagmamalabis ng mga opisyal ay sabihin sa akin, o sabihin sa aking mga kasama.

Marami pang kailangang gawin, mga kaibigan. Inuulit ko na naman. Dalawa ang krisis nating hinaharap—recession at saka iyong inflation. Sa inflation, nasabi ko na nga sa inyo maski na itaas ang minimum wage ng mga management, palagay nating itaas iyang minimum wage na umabot sa dalawampung piso sa isang araw ay kung ang presyo naman ay doble sa presyo ngayon, eh wala ding kabuluhan ang pagtataas ng minimum wage na iyan. Maski na ano pa ang ibigay sa inyong tulong, mga kaibigan, ang unang-unang dapat gawin ng isang pamahalaan that thinks of the laboring class, that thinks of the greater mass of our people is to keep down these prices or otherwise fight inflation. An International Monetary Fund team and a

World Bank team have come to the Philippines. I am sure that some of them are listening to me now. I was surprised when they told me: "Do you know, Mr. President, that your biggest achievement so far is, at least this year, bringing down the rate of inflation from 30 percent all the way down possibly to 8 percent."

Now, I, more or less, knew that we have brought it down but I didn't realize that it has gone down that much and I asked for a confirmation. Secretary Ople and I immediately got in touch with the National Economic and Development Authority and the Department of Trade with the various agencies that have been monitoring all these things, including the Central Bank, the Bureau of Census and Statistics, everything, and I asked that there should be a confirmation of the fact that there has been a reduction. Bumaba ang mga presyo. There has been a reduction from the old 30 percent of increase of prices all the way down to below 10 percent, possibly 8 percent. We will know in a few days after the studies are finished.

Now, I think that on this day, May 1st, if there is anything that can be offered by any political leadership to you, the working men in the Philippines, is that we have returned the value of the peso and the increase of purchasing power of that currency which you earn and which brings about your purchase of all that you need in life. This, to me, is the best offering that we can make and I pledge to you that while I am the President of the Republic of the Philippines, we shall consider the welfare of the working man as the primary factor in decision-making.

Now, in recession. What is the historical percentage of unemployment in the Philippines? The historical percentage of unemployment in the Philippines is 8 percent to 10 percent. We say that there are 14 million members of the laboring class in the Philippines. This means there are 14 million who are employable from the age of 10 to a higher age bracket because we are a farming and agricultural country. The International Labor Organization standard is different. The ILO standard is 14 years, so I have directed the secretary of labor to start now shifting our statistics towards the ILO standard and I quote this because of the fact that when you hear that there is unemployment probably they are mostly 10-year-olds, 10-year-olds who don't have any means of livelihood but who actually stay out in the farm.

Today, after two and a half years of martial law or of the New Society, the rate of unemployment is 4.2 percent from the one million unemployed to 600,000 over a period of two years. It is our hope that we shall be able to

maintain this, at least. In 1973, our gross national product went up to 10 percent, then in 1974, it went down to 6 percent, and we hope that we will be able to maintain a growth of 6 percent. Actually, 5.9 percent but in round number, it is 6 percent.

This is the first indication of the health of the economy. The first thing that I spoke of was inflation, now unemployment. But the general health of the economy affects the laboring class and the entrepreneurs, the management class. If the economy is not healthy, I don't care what initiative the management class may demonstrate or how much industry, courage and daring you manifest, we will get nowhere. And that is why this is a partnership between the government, management and labor.

Today, my friends, I am very happy to say that we have fared better than most countries not only in Asia but also throughout the world. Tayo ay magpasalamat sa Poong Maykapal na tayo ay tinangkilik at tinulungan sa ating kahirapan. At kahimanawari, mga kaibigan, ay huwag nating limutin ang lahat ng ating mga pangako. Wika nga ng ating mga manipesto at resolusyon, kami ay handang maghikahos at tangkilikin ang Bagong Lipunan. I hold you to that commitment.

And on my side, I can say, I pledge to you that we will always consider the interests of the laboring class. Incidentally, you speak of participation of labor in the decision-making. Labor is now represented in the Government Service Insurance System, in the Social Security System, and in the National Manpower and Youth Council. Also I would like to announce that I am going to include a labor representative in the Employees Compensation Commission. I would like to announce now that I am creating a new position of governor of the Board of Investments to which I shall appoint a labor leader within the next month.

At the same time, I would like to inform you that Secretary Ople is supposed to be your representative in the National Economic and Development Authority which is on Cabinet level, both a planning and implementing body. As chairman of the NEDA, I will create a new board of adviser and I intend to appoint a representative of labor, one of the labor leaders, and a representative of management.

I now direct the secretary of labor to look into all these resolutions, especially on the Workmen's Compensation Act. I gathered that there has been a lowering of the amount paid to those who died in the accidents in the last several months. I direct the chairman of the Employees'

Compensation Commission, Secretary Ople, to now increase the compensation and death benefits from ₱6,000 to ₱12,000.

I would like you to monitor all of these. Don't wait for Labor Day next year. Baka ang gagawin na lamang ninyo ay makikinig kayo dito pagkatapos ay hindi ninyo susundan kay Secretary Ople. Huwag na ninyong hintayin ang Mayo. Baka maghihintay na naman tayo ng 1976 niyan. Hinihintay ko ang ating mga labor leaders na tawagin ang pansin ng secretary of labor kung wala pang nagagawa tungkol sa mga bagay na ito. At aking hinihingi, inuulit, na ang ating mga manggagawa ang ating pinakamata at dila sa ating mga ginagawa sa Bagong Lipunan.

At ngayon, mga kaibigan, inuulit ko na naman. Habang ako ang Pangulo ng Republika ng Pilipinas umasa kayong lahat ng manggagawa, magbubukid, mangingisda, aking mga kapwa kapus-palad, na ang inyong kailangan ang ating unang-unang aalagatain, sa anumang gagawin ng ating pamahalaan. It will be the deciding factor in all decisions. At tayo ay magpasalamat sa Poong Maykapal at humingi sa Kanya ng tulong at tangkilik sapagka't tayo ay humaharap ng maraming mga panganib sa mga araw pang darating. Tayo ay humingi sa Kanya ng tulong at lakas upang ating matuklasan ang kinabukasan na di lamang mariwasa, masagana kung hindi tahimik. Maraming salamat sa inyong lahat,

(SPEECH OF PRESIDENT MARCOS DURING THE OBSERVANCE OF
CORREGIDOR DAY, CORREGIDOR, MAY 6, 1975)

To come to a monument like Corregidor is to participate in reminiscence of both humiliation as well as victory. We come here to commemorate the fall of Corregidor on May 6, 1942 and the surrender of American and Philippine troops to Japanese forces. Many years before that, on the same date (May 6, 1898), the American forces took over from the Spanish forces.

In 1600, the Spaniards took over Corregidor from the Dutch. The Dutch had taken over before that. In 1570, the Spaniards took over from what is referred to in the history books as the Moros or the Muslim invaders who came from the South, some of whom were our forebears. It is said that Rajah Matanda and his nephew, Rajah Soliman, the last ruler of Manila, fought the Chinese corsair who, as early as 1220, occupied Corregidor.

We, therefore, come to an island which symbolizes the change of sovereignty from one country and one race to another. It also symbolizes the futility of wars as the continued violence does not end with peace. At the same time, however, Corregidor has turned into a monument of the unconquerable spirit of the free man. When men offer their lives whether in war or in peace for the attainment of a dream, they are driven not only by hope but by the firm conviction and the knowledge that there will be others after them who will pursue their dream if they cannot attain such dreams in their lifetime.

I am certain that the men who perished in the battle here since the 13th century had this hope. Who were they who died in 1942 and 1945 on this hallowed ground—Corregidor? There were Filipinos, it's true, but there were also Americans and Japanese.

Thus, today, it has been my privilege to invite not only the highest representative of the United States of America but also that of the Japanese government in order that, jointly, we may pay homage to those who died in complete faith and belief in what they were fighting for.

Monuments are symbols of stone and steel that stand to remind men not only of the bravery and courage, the daring and unconquerable spirit of one race but also of all men. Thus, Corregidor now stands as such a symbol. From all accounts, the Japanese who died on this island were more than Filipinos and Americans.

In the last battle, when the American forces, both by amphibious and air drop operations, with a force of around 3,000 men in 1945, taking over the island on May 2 of

that year, the entire Japanese defense force of about 4,700 men died except for a few whom you could count on the fingers of your hand.

The United States forces composed of one infantry battalion—the 3rd Battalion and the 34th Infantry—conducted the amphibious assault from Mariveles Bay and the parachute drop by the 503rd Parachute Regiment Combat Team. This was the story of 1945.

Let us go back to 1942. As of April 10, 1942, Corregidor was defended by 10,891 men, a number which was further to be swelled by the ranks of escapists from Bataan by several thousands more. The United States Armed Forces had 8,121 men, most of them non-combatants. The Philippine Scouts had 1,028 men and the Philippine Army, 1,642 men.

The units that defended Corregidor in 1942 were the 60th Coast Artillery, the United States regular army, the 91st Coast Artillery, Philippine Scouts, the 59th Coast Artillery, Philippine Scouts, the 59th Coast Artillery, the United States regular army, the 92nd Crafter Drawn Coast Artillery, Philippine Scouts; the Headquarters Harbor defense of Manila and Seawards Defense Command; the 4th Marine Regiment and the Philippine Army troops as well as the escapists from Bataan.

The armaments or the heavy guns mounted on Corregidor were: eight 12-inch guns, 12 12-inch mortars, two 10-inch guns, five 6-inch guns, 20 155 millimeter guns and some anti-aircraft guns. These guns were invulnerable to direct fire but they were easy targets for air attacks and plunging or high angle fire from artillery. Mobile guns like the 155mm were also prepared for alternate positions.

The Japanese assault in 1942 was a joint army-navy and air force operations. Pre-invasion bombing was conducted by the Japanese air force. The army provided the landing force while the navy conducted the landing force. The landing force that attacked Corregidor was composed of the 4th Division, the 7th Tank Regiment, the 3rd Battalion and a Mountain Artillery Regiment. It was organized into two landing teams, one of which almost lost its way but carried by the currents finally landed at the tail of the tadpole that is Corregidor.

The landing force that attacked El Prayle, Carabao and Caraballo Islands of Cavite was the 15th Division. The casualties during the last stage of the fighting in 1942 were Philippine Army and US Army troops—2,000 casual-

ties, 800 of whom were Americans, the rest Filipinos. The Japanese suffered about 4,000 or a ratio of 2 to 1 against the attacking force.

So Corregidor now stands as a grim reminder of the lessons that we cannot ignore. If we are to keep faith with these men who died here we must frankly restate those lessons. As has been said in the past, and I remember that even Ambassador Sullivan referred to it in the last ceremonies here, Corregidor was one of those magnificent and permanent installations that followed the static and immobile type of defense—the type of defense that has been considered *passe* for sometime now, which was the fashion in that period of world history.

Corregidor, like Singapore, was considered an impregnable fortress. Unfortunately, its defenses were designed for a style of warfare which belonged to the past. For the military planners were unmindful of the dominance of air power that was to come nor the capability of artillery fire which, of course, has been demonstrated repeatedly and of which Napoleon reminded all of Europe and the world when he was in command of the French troops.

This installation, without any head cover and protection from above, was easily vulnerable to air power and to high angle of plunging artillery fire. Designed as an anchor for the defense of Manila Bay, most of its guns were trained upward in anticipation of an attack from the sea, or trained towards the south.

Like Singapore, this installation was practically useless when the enemy, attacking from land, captured the city of Manila as well as Bataan and Cavite. The attacking force had learned the lessons of the past and refused to fight on the terms set by the defending force, so they easily turned this installation from the rear rendering almost completely useless the long prepared armaments. This was the misconception, the miscalculation from the narrower perspective of national defense.

This was the tragedy or rather the military tragedy that was Corregidor. It spoke of a defense concept and strategy that was outdated, for it was the static, the Maginot line concept of defense which events proved and turned out to be obsolete, costly and invalid.

This points out the flaw in the strategic thinking of most military minds that refused to grow with the times. It is quite obvious that the same strategic thinking prevailed in the formulation of the plans for the defense of this country, by both Filipinos and Americans. It envisioned

the conduct of conventional war with mass formations occupying fixed lines of defense.

However, hardly a thought was given to the continuation of the war by guerrilla warfare, after the collapse of organized resistance. Neither has the entire population ever considered the fact of the country's total defense. But in fairness to the planners, both Filipinos and Americans, especially Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. Charles Willoughby, an intelligence officer of the Southwest Pacific Area Command who has just come out with a book on the guerrilla resistance movement in the Philippines, it must be fair to state that they recognized the value and effectiveness of guerrilla warfare in the Philippines but the recognition came late and only during the course of the war, not before it.

As such, guerrilla warfare was not a part of deliberate planning for the defense concept and it was not integrated into the total defense efforts. All those who participated in the underground or the guerrilla movement in the Philippines, must remember the disunity, the heart-breaking lack of coordination that resulted in casualties displayed among the resistance members to the very bitter end of the fight.

It is quite obvious that guerrilla warfare sprang up in the country not so much on the part of the plan of defense by the military thinkers defending the Philippines but rather after the fall of Bataan and Corregidor and the collapse of organized resistance by our regular troops. Guerrilla warfare sprang up not by premeditated design but from the innate predisposition of our people to this type of warfare, coupled with a terrain in our country that lends itself to the start of unconventional warfare.

Why do I say innate predisposition? Because our history, our entire struggle as a people indicate the natural inclination of our people to utilize guerrilla warfare against our enemy. We resorted to it during the four centuries of Spanish rule. It was our principal means of attack against both Spanish and American forces in 1896 to 1902, and we resorted to it during the Japanese occupation to overcome the enemy's superiority in both numbers and weaponry.

With this style of fighting, we made it costly for the occupying forces and we were able to prolong our resistance. It can be said that as early as 1898, we have demonstrated our capability for guerrilla warfare, for it took the American occupation army only 11 months to subdue the regular army of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo and of Gen.

Antonio Luna, while it took the U. S. occupation army more than two and a half years of bitter and dirty fighting, suffering more casualties, spending more funds and energy, employing more troops, to subdue the Filipino guerrillas who carried the struggle in our hills.

A similar problem confronted the Japanese occupation army, compelling them to leave behind in the Philippines sizable forces which could have been employed decisively elsewhere. And when the United States forces landed in the Philippines, the Japanese forces were compelled to fight on two fronts, one of them the guerrilla front.

Contemporary events in neighboring countries merely dramatized and confirmed these very obvious lessons. Lest these words of mine be misinterpreted, however, as seeking to transmit to our people a message of alarm, of possibility of aggression from outside the Philippines and attack upon our country, let me hasten to add that the threat to the Philippines and which we may face later or now will not come from any outright, open and frank external aggression, by an enemy that is identifiable, as we saw as it happened in the second World War. Rather, the danger to our country is and will be a massive type of infiltration which will probably seek to support with arms, with equipment, funds and supplies coming from outside the Philippines, supporting whether covertly or openly an indigenous rebel force within the Philippines that seeks to overthrow established government.

Contemporary events now indicate that this is the new type of aggression favored by most predatory countries; while subtle, covert and often difficult to prove, it has been effective not only in subverting governments and republics but actually resulted in the take-over and the seizure of political power by force and violence. It is less costly in terms of funds and of life of the supporting country, less rich in terms of international prestige and certainly leads all options to the intervening powers open for exploitation.

We must not be caught unprepared for such a type of a war. Preparations should include not only providing for the weapons and the training but also continuously updating the concept of warfare, fundamental and indispensable to this, preparation is to provide our people a cause for unity and for fighting, the will to fight, the will to survive, the will to defend and protect our country and our race.

For unless there is an intense motivation or at least a knowledge of the reasons for sacrificing all including life and honor itself, all other preparations will be for

naught. The armaments will be like the armaments of Corregidor that were practically useless in the defense of our country.

It has been said that in countries that have witnessed the fall of government under attack, the government armed forces collapsed not so much because of the pressure of the enemy force from outside but more because of the disintegration from within brought about by the lack of the will to fight, lack of a motivation on the part of the armed forces, and worst on the part of the civilian population.

The government armed forces are not only a mirror of the society from which they spring. One cannot expect the armed forces of any country to have the will to fight if such a will to fight is absent in the mother society itself. Thus, it is that we seek to establish a new order and a new society in our country. This is the reform movement that seeks to rid our society of its inequities, its vices, its injustices, the ills and the debilitating corruption of old, and replace these with the quality of opportunity that we give to all, the craving for national unity—all these should provide the people a cause and a will to fight, and to defend their country.

When every Filipino sees, understands, appreciates, and enjoys the fruits of these national efforts, then will he realize that he is fighting for himself, his family and, incidentally, for his country and his people. And thus, if we should ever fight any aggression of any type, it will be with everyone in our country participating in and at the disposal of the general effort. It will be a total war for us as all wars of defense of the country must be total wars, a total defense wherein every able-bodied citizen, armed or unarmed, shall form part of the country's total effort.

We shall fight in the entire spectrum of warfare from the conventional to the unconventional. We are not going to fall again into the mistake of leaving our defense partly organized and the rest left to chance. For us, the conduct of all defenses shall be organized from the beginning to the end. Our armed forces, both regular and reserve, the entire population shall be so organized and trained to carry on the fight under a legitimate and recognized government from conventional warfare to guerrilla warfare.

We will adopt our own style of fighting in accordance with the situation. This necessarily implies dynamic flexibility in our defense posture, one that can readily adjust in fluidity to any given situation or to the changing fortunes of war. This calls for the proficiency of our armed forces in the conduct of both conventional and guerrilla

warfare tailored after the appropriate organization, providing the right type of equipment and weaponry, and the formulation of correct strategy and tactics for the pursuit of this type of national defense.

In short, we will fight on our own terms, not those dictated by the enemy. The policy of self-reliance shall not depend on material wherewithals and equipment and armaments alone. More importantly, the self-reliance that we envisioned to develop is primarily one of the spirit, one that transforms adversity to challenge, and challenge to opportunity for summoning forth native ingenuities to attain self-sufficiency. Only in this larger sense indeed may our own people be equipped with the vital will and fire to win and to endure.

In preparing ourselves for any eventuality, we do not guarantee that no invader shall ever transgress our land, but we do guarantee that we shall make it too costly for him at a price we shall dictate for him to even think of such an endeavor. Above all, we aim to live at peace with all as friends and equals, extending our hands to all in want and sincerity, helpful too but subservient to none.

To those who fought on this sacred ground, living and dead, whose memories we all honor today, we cannot but agree that this is the court that this country must charge for itself if it has to keep faith with them.

Thank you and good day.

MGA HATOL NG KATAAS-TAASANG HUKUMAN
(DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT)

[No. L-29356. October 31, 1974]

FIRST DIVISION

DAVAO FREE WORKERS FRONT and/or VICENTE R. VILLARIN, et al., petitioners, *vs.* COURT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, 7-UP BOTTLING COMPANY OF THE PHILIPPINES and/or SANTIAGO SYJUCO, JR., 7-UP BOTTLING COMPANY OF THE PHILIPPINES (DAVAO BRANCH) and/or GUILLERMO S. SANCHEZ, et al., respondents.

Cesar E. Nitorreda for the petitioners.

Jose W. Diokno and *Sergio L. Guadiz* for the respondents.

APPEAL from a decision of the Court of Industrial Relations.

SYNOPSIS

The trial court rendered judgment finding respondents guilty of unfair labor practices and ordered the reinstatement of the dismissed employees with full back wages until actual reinstatement and to allow the return to work of the striking members with strike-duration pay. All five judges sustained the findings on unfair labor practices and voted for reinstatement and the strikers' return to work. However, three separate opinions were filed which *altered and modified* the trial court's judgment awarding back wages and strike duration pay. Both parties appealed, but respondents' separate appeal was denied "for being factual and for lack of merit." The Supreme Court granted the petition at bar upholding the trial court's decision awarding full back wages to dismissed employees without qualification from dismissal to reinstatement and to the strikers strike duration pay. Following the precedent in Mercury Drug Co., the strike duration pay for the period of over 9 years was fixed at the equivalent of 5 years without deduction to obviate the protracted process of determining amount of earnings elsewhere.

SYLLABUS
of the Ruling of the Court

1. EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES; REINSTATEMENT; BACKWAGES; WHEN EMPLOYEES ENTITLED TO BACKWAGES WITHOUT EXCLUSION OF PERIOD WHEN CASE WAS PENDING.—Where the employer obstinately opposed the order of reinstatement and return of the workers by pleading an entirely new matter, namely that reinstatement cannot be effected because of closure of the employer's plant, which the court found to have been resorted to in bad faith to circumvent the order of reinstatement, payment of full back wages without exclusion of any

period during which the case was pending determination will be awarded to the illegally dismissed employees.

2. **ID.; ID.; ID.; ID.**—The Supreme Court's denial of respondents' separate petition by way of appeal from the judgment at bar forecloses any dispute in the case at bar as to the judgment ordering the reinstatement of dismissed employees with full backwages without deduction or qualification.
3. **ID.; ID.; ID.; ID.; PENDENCY OF CASE SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AT THE EXPENSE AND PREJUDICE OF AGGRIEVED WORKERS.**—Where the employer is guilty of oppressive and unfair labor practices, discriminatory acts and union-busting activities, it must bear the full consequences of its acts particularly where it obstinately persisted in refusing to reinstate the unlawfully dismissed employees and accept the returning strikers notwithstanding that its appeal to the Supreme Court had been rejected. To favor the offender-employer as against the aggrieved workers would not be in consonance with the constitutional mandate that the State afford protection to labor and the statutory injunctions against the employer's unfair labor practices and oppressive acts against labor. While the judge would have the respondent court take a share of its fault for the long pendency of the case, this should not be done, however, at the expense and to the prejudice of aggrieved workers who should be duly indemnified for their lost earnings as a direct result of their illegal dismissal and to the favor and advantage of the offender-employer.
4. **ID.; ID.; ILLEGALLY DISMISSED EMPLOYEES SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO TAKE MEDICAL EXAMINATION AS A CONDITION PRECEDENT FOR REINSTATEMENT.**—The dismissed and striking members of petitioner union should not be required to undergo a medical examination as a condition precedent for reinstatement or return to work. The filing and pendency of an unfair labor practice case presupposes a continuing employer-employee relationship and when the case is decided in favor of the workers, this relationship in law is deemed to have continued uninterruptedly notwithstanding their unlawful dismissal or the lawful strike and stoppage of work, and hence, seniority and other privileges are preserved in their favor. To require them to undergo a physical or medical examination simply because of the long pendency of their case which is due to no fault of theirs would not only defeat the purpose of the law and the constitutional and statutory mandates to protect labor but would work to their unfair prejudice as aggrieved parties and give an undue advantage to employers as the offenders who have the means and resources to wage attrition and withstand the bane of protracted litigation.
5. **ID.; ID.; ID.**—Aggrieved workers may be subjected to periodic physical or medical examination as old reinstated workers, but not as a precondition to their reinstatement or return to work—with the important consequence that if they are found to be ill or suffering from some disability, they would be entitled to all the benefits that the laws and company practices provide by way of compensation, medical care, disability benefits and gratuities to employess and workers.
6. **ID.; ID.; STRIKE DURATION PAY SUSTAINED.**—The award of strike duration pay less earnings must be sustained on the same considerations that justify the award of backwages to the

dismissed employees, who were left no other alternative by their employer's improper and oppressive conduct but to declare a strike.

7. *Id.*; *Id.*; *Id.*; **REQUIRING EMPLOYER TO PAY BACKWAGES WITHOUT QUALIFICATION IS IMPOSED IN THE FORM OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES.**—Where the employers obstinately refused to reinstate the unlawfully dismissed employees, notwithstanding that the judgment for reinstatement had become final, they will have to pay full backwages without qualification as a form of punitive damages, by way of example, and for the public good.
8. *Id.*; *Id.*; **IMPLEMENTATION OF FINAL JUDGMENT FOR REINSTATEMENT; CASE REMANDED FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.**—Since the matter of closure of the employer's plant is entirely a new matter on which the parties make separate claims, this case will have to be *remanded* for further proceedings to receive evidence and decide: (a) whether the closure of the plant is for a justifiable cause, as alleged by respondents; or is resorted to in order to circumvent the judgment for reinstatement of the unlawfully dismissed employees and return to work of the striking members of petitioner union, whose strike has been found to be just and lawful, as alleged by petitioners; (b) if the closure is found to be justified, whether or not on the basis of the evidence, it is feasible (and acceptable to the workers) to order the reinstatement and return to work of the employees in the employer's other branches or to put them on a preferential waiting list for that purpose, on the basis of the exigencies of its business; (c) if the closure is found to be unjustified, to determine the most practical and expeditious means to enforce reinstatement and return to work of the workers; and (d) in either case, whether or not the closure is found to be justified, whether the payment of backwages with or without deduction to the unlawfully dismissed employees shall still continue after the date of finality of this judgment or shall cease considering the substantial backwages without deduction awarded under the judgment.
9. *Id.*; *Id.*; **STRIKE DURATION PAY FIXED AT THE EQUIVALENT OF FIVE YEARS WITHOUT HAVING TO DETERMINE AMOUNT OF EARNINGS ELSEWHERE.**—The trial court's judgment ordering respondents to allow the return to work of the strikers with strike duration pay "from the date of the strike up to the receipt of decision" less earnings elsewhere earned in the form of salaries or wages is reinstated. However, following the precedent of the Mercury Drug Co. case, in the light of the circumstances of record in the case at bar, the strike duration pay for the period of over nine years without going through the protracted process of determining the amount of such earnings elsewhere is fixed at the equivalent of 5 years wages *net* without deduction and qualification as the just and reasonable amount payable to the said employees.

OPINION OF THE COURT.

TEEHANKEE, *J.*:

On the basis of the undisputed findings of respondent court that respondent employer was guilty of grossly unfair labor practices and discriminatory acts aimed at the elimination of petitioner labor union which fully justified petitioner union's strike, as affirmed by this Court's

action in September, 1968 which rejected respondents' separate appeal therefrom in Case L-29331 "for being factual and for lack of merit," the Court sustains petitioners' appeal at bar. Since all five judges of respondent court concurred in these facts and voted in favor of the reinstatement of the nine unlawfully dismissed petitioners-employees and of the strikers' return to work, the Court grants with modifications the petition for upholding the trial court's decision awarding the nine unlawfully dismissed employees full back-wages without qualification from dismissal to reinstatement and to the striking members of petitioner union strike-duration pay less earnings elsewhere (as against the lesser award granted by the split majority of respondent court *en banc*).

On the unfair labor practice complaint filed on July 26, 1957 by the court of industrial relations prosecutor on behalf of petitioner union, Davao Free Workers Front and its president Vicente R. Villarin and ten other members who are all co-petitioners at bar, the trial court's affirmative findings of unfair labor practice as charged were unanimously reaffirmed by all five (5) members of respondent industrial court *en banc*.

The trial court as presided by Judge Joaquin M. Salvador found in its decision of September 5, 1966 that respondent employer 7-UP Bottling Company of the Philippines at its Davao branch refused to bargain with petitioner union; interfered with and coerced its members to vote for its hand-picked candidate as president of petitioner union; required the members of petitioner union to join the Seven-UP Employees Association; a newly organized labor union obviously sponsored and favored by it with which it immediately executed a collective bargaining agreement granting the members of such new union fringe benefits while refusing to bargain with petitioner union regarding the *renewal* of their just-expired contract and instead foisting upon petitioner union its unilateral version of a collective bargaining agreement; and filed a notice of lock-out and *refused entry* to members of petitioner union when the latter refused to accept its unilateral contract version; and that respondent employer's union-busting and discriminatory acts led petitioner union justifiably to declare a strike on August 6, 1957 against respondents' unfair labor practices.

These unfair labor practices and discriminatory acts as found by respondent court and which are *undisputed* by respondent employer and have already been *affirmed* by this Court in September, 1968 when it denied due course to respondents' petition for review¹ were specified in the trial court's decision, as follows:

"Based on the evidence adduced, it appears that the complainant union and respondent Company entered into a bargaining agreement on June 15, 1956 effective for a period of one year (Exh. 'A' or '28', Record p. 83). This agreement in one part recognizes the complainant union as the sole bargaining agent for all its members (par. 1, *supra*). In other portions of the contract benefits were accorded to employees, and without distinction as to whether they are members of the union or not. The impression created by the agreement is that the complainant union was the *sole* bargaining agent for the employees and nothing else. This is further confirmed by the testimony adduced (tsn., pp. 9-10, Feb. 10, 1958), as well as the opening paragraph of the agreement. At the same time, it must be observed that under the law, the labor organization who is a party to the collective bargaining agreement is presumed to be the majority representative of the employees.

"Sometime in December 1956, respondent Guillermo Sanchez called the president of the complainant union. The former presented to the latter a draft of the collective bargaining agreement as a basis for a new contract as the existing agreement was to expire on June 15, 1957 (tsn., pp. 15, Feb. 19, 1958; 395-401, March 13, 1958; 634-638, June 2, 1958; 151-154, March 23, 1960; Exhibits 'B' and '29', pp. 85-90, Record). This draft recognizes the complainant union as the 'only legitimate, duly organized and existing labor union' and the 'unquestioned exclusive representative of all the workers and employees' in respondents' Davao Plant. There is also a grant of P0.25 as an increase for daily workers and an equivalent amount for employees paid on monthly basis.

"Thereafter, several communications were exchanged between the complainants and respondents concerning collective bargaining negotiations (Exhs. '1', '2' and '3').

"The complainant union, on the other hand, has answered the communications as shown by Exhibit 'C' (pp. 91-92, Record). It even said that it was ready to bargain on the proposals and counter-proposals.

"The union deliberated on the proposals contained in Exhibit 'B' and on March 26, 1957 commented on them and made counter-proposals (Exh. 'C'). The company, it would seem, appears indifferent to the union proposals, although an attempt was made to show that a reply was made by respondent Company on March 28, 1957 (Exh. '4'). Nevertheless, it is certain that a reply was made to the union's counter-proposals on May 13, 1957 (Exh. 'H' and '13'), which we will discuss later on in relation to the attendant circumstances to this case.

"Sometime on February 24, 1957, which was a Sunday, respondents Guillermo S. Sanchez and Robert M. Perez, plant manager and accountant, respectively of the respondent company, checked the funds handled by Francisco Diongson, the union treasurer. These officials have learned that Diongson had collected strike funds from their union members late on Saturday morning, February 23, 1957. Finding that Diongson had *more* than company funds in the cashier's cage because of the strike funds which he did not deem provident to withdraw late on Saturday evening as he could not then deposit the same with the Bank, Diongson was asked by the company to explain within six hours such purported 'technical malversation' (Exh. 'S') without the case having

¹ Its petition to have this Court review these findings and the order to reinstate the dismissed petitioners with backwages and accept back the strikers, docketed as L-29331 was denied due course. See *infra*, pp. 9-11.

been brought to a grievance hearing as provided for in the existing collective bargaining agreement. The respondent dismissed Diongson but he was later on temporarily reinstated (Exh. 'T'). It would seem that despite the absence of any missing funds, an oversupply of the same is also a liability but which the company later on rectified by Diongson's reinstatement.

"The elections for the officers of the complainant union was held on May 12, 1957. Prior to this date respondent Gregorio Divino made known his intention to run for the presidency and intimated that somebody was backing him up and he had an understanding with the respondent Guillermo Sanchez (tsn., pp. 147-149, 153, Feb. 10, 1958). Said respondent (Divino) was at the time a member of the Board of Directors of complainant union (tsn., p. 1773, April 16, 1959). In fact, in a Resolution of March 19, 1957 wherein it was stated that harmony can never be created in respondent company as long as respondents Sanchez, Perez and Vega are managing the respondent company, said respondent Divino was one of the signatories (Exh. 'CC').

"In the meanwhile to assure the presence of all the members, the complainant union sent a letter to respondent Guillermo Sanchez requesting that no work be required of the employer on the date mentioned. This letter was sent three weeks before the date set for the elections (Exhs. '7', tsn., pp. 282-284, March 12, 1958).

"Likewise, before the elections a member of the Board of complainant union together with several members were called by respondent Sanchez. The latter tried to convince them to vote for the right man so there will be no trouble in the company (tsn., p. 690, Jan. 2, 1958). Further, on May 11, 1957, a day before the election, a member of complainant union was called by respondent Zoilo Boncan, salesman in charge in the company (Exh. '24', tsn., p. 1048, June 4, 1958), and the former was told by the latter to vote for respondent Divino for union president as he, (Divino), was the *choice of the company* (tsn., pp. 1051-1055, June 4, 1958).

"On the day of the elections several of the respondents were seen in the immediate vicinity of the place where the same was to be held and remained there until the same was over (tsn., p. 686, June 2, 1958; p. 1060, June 4, 1958). In the voting that followed, respondent Divino who ran for the presidency lost by a wide margin to complainant Vicente Villarin (Exh. '11').

"After the canvass was over, one of the individual complainants was accosted by respondent Zoilo Boncan and was called a traitor for not voting for Gregorio Divino (tsn., pp. 1061-1064, 1114, June 5, 1958). Significantly, respondent Boncan was never presented as a witness on the ground that he has resigned from the employ of respondent company (tsn., pp. 130-139, Feb. 24, 1961).

"The following day May 13, 1957, after the elections mentioned, respondent Guillermo Sanchez sent a letter to complainant union (Exhs. 'H' and '31') which reiterated the company's previous position. It stated further 'that you can make your choice of accepting or refusing the draft that we submitted to you. * * *. If we can not agree among ourselves and observe industrial peace, then *we have to shut up Davao Plant, if necessary.*

"On May 14, 1957, complainant Romeo Pallar, the object of the ire of respondent Zoilo Boncan was not allowed to enter the gate of respondent Company's compound by respondent Divino. The latter told the former that he (Pallar) cannot work anymore (tsn., pp. 1004-1065, June 4, 1958; 1195-1196, June 6, 1958).

"A week after this union election, respondent Gregorio Divino started organizing *another* union which eventually became the Seven-Up Employees Association (SEAD) for short, tsn., pp. 1784-1787, April 16, 1959). His reason for organizing another labor organization was allegedly due to the information that the complainant union was staging a strike and will be demanding for a closed shop and added that those people who were with him will be out of work (tsn., p. 1790, April 16, 1959). This, in deed, does not seem to be in keeping with previous actuations of the said respondent. As early as February 17, 1957, this respondent was one of the signatories to a resolution of the complainant union to create a strike fund (Exh. 'Y'). Sometime on March 3 and 19, 1957, he himself collected from certain employees amounts as contributions to the strike fund (Exhs. 'X' & 'x-1').

"On May 24, 1957, respondent through its vice-president filed a notice of *lockout* with Regional Office No. 1 of the Department of Labor against the members of complainant union allegedly for failure of management and the union to agree on the terms of the proposed renewal of the collective bargaining agreement (Exhs. 'E' and '13').

"About the end of May 1957, respondent Gregorio Divino stated he left the complainant union (tsn., 1894-1895, April 17, 1957).

"On June 1, 1957, complainants Josefino Alpas, Bonifacio Pionso, Miguel Navales, Florentino Hatamosa, Lauro Octot, Lorenzo Laguna, Francisco Dujale and Jose Corporal were *refused entry* to respondent company's premises by respondent Gregorio Divino. They were told that the refusal was the order of respondent Guillermo Sanchez. It was stated that respondent Divino told them further that had they not been members of complainant union, they would have been allowed to work (tsn., pp. 1214-1331, June 6, 1958; 1282-1284, 1327, 1351-1352, Nov. 17, 1958; 1426-1427, 1467-1469, Nov. 18, 1958; 1538-1540, Nov. 19, 1958; 1622-1623, 1662-1666, April 15 1959; 1812-1818, April 16, 1959). Attempts were further made by the same respondent to persuade the said complainants to join the SEAD. On the other hand, respondent Gregorio Divino *admitted* that he did really refuse entry to the said complainants as their names were not in the list sent by respondent Guillermo Sanchez (Exhs. '5-00' and '24'). An examination of the list shows that it was made several months prior to June 1, 1957, e.g., on Aug. 1956. The complainants have been going to and from subsequent to August 15, 1956 and it was only on June 1, 1957 that respondent Divino conveniently discovered that their names are not listed in the same.

"On June 20, 1957, the SEAD was issued a registration certificate (Exh. '1'-GD'). Two days after its registration and two days before the thirty-day period of the lock-out notice of respondent company, the SEAD sent a letter asking the respondent company for recognition as the sole and collective bargaining agent of all the employees of the Davao plant (Exh. 'K', p. 106 of Record). The letter in question does not embody proposals of any kind whatsoever.

"On June 28, 1957, a collective bargaining agreement was signed between the SEAD and the respondent company embodying terms and conditions of employment (Exh. '4-00', p. 122, Record). Certain fringe benefits were granted and SEAD was recognized as the representative of its members only. It is interesting to note that respondent Divino, the president of the SEAD, does *not* remember if he ever furnished a list of his members to the respondent company. Neither does he know how the respondent com-

pany was able to determine who are the members entitled to the benefits granted by the agreement (tsn., pp. 13-17, March 21, 1960).

"On August 6, 1957, the complainant union struck (tsn., p. 271, March 12, 1958, Exh. 'L') based on the acts herein cited."

The trial court thus rendered judgment finding respondents guilty of unfair labor practices and ordering them to reinstate the nine illegally dismissed employees-petitioners with full backwages until actual reinstatement and to allow the return to work of the striking members of petitioner union with strike-duration pay, as follows:

"WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing the respondent Company, Seven-Up Bottling Company of the Philippines, by its officers and agents, is hereby found guilty of unfair labor practices and is hereby ordered to:

"(a) Reinstate complainants Josefino Alpas; Miguel Navales, Romeo Pallar, Florentino Hatamosa, Bonifacio Pionso,* Francisco Dujale, Lauro Octot, Lorenzo Lalaguna, and Pepe Corporal to their former and equivalent positions with full backwages from dates of their respective dismissals until they are actually reinstated;

"(b) Allow the return to work of any members of the complainant union who have refused to work as a consequence of the strike of August 6, 1957, and to give strike duration pay to any such member equivalent to what such member would normally have earned as wages during the period from the date of the strike up to the receipt of the Decision but deducting therefrom any amount he has earned elsewhere in the form of salaries and/or wages, without loss of seniority and other benefits granted by the Company."

The case was complicated for petitioners, however, by respondent court's resolution *en banc* dated November 2, 1966, but actually promulgated and served almost *two years later* in July, 1968, resolving respondents' motion for reconsideration. While the *en banc* resolution "fails to find sufficient justification in altering or modifying the aforesaid decision" and all members of respondent court were unanimous that respondents were guilty of grave unfair labor practices and anti-union acts designed to destroy petitioner union and that petitioners were entitled to reinstatement, three separate opinions were filed which *in fact altered and modified* the trial court's judgment awarding backwages and strike duration pay.

Then presiding judge Arsenio I. Martinez filed a concurring and dissenting opinion dated November 10, 1966 concurred in by then judge Emiliano C. Tabigne, wherein although "concurring in the findings of unfair labor practice" and "that this strike was staged on account of discriminatory acts of the respondent company," they voted *against* the payment of any backwages and strike duration

* Written as "Privado" in the decision, Annex I, petition, Rollo, p. 123.

pay on general grounds of "wielding our discretionary authority so as to be consistent with justice and equity."

Then judge Amando C. Bugayong filed a concurring opinion dated *July 5, 1968* stressing that "the evidence adduce left no room for further doubts" as to respondents' unfair labor practices and that "the strike . . . came about as a result of the discriminatory acts of the company but voted for a modified award of backwages and strike duration pay "from the time of dismissal of the aggrieved workers only until this case was submitted for resolution [on October 25, 1961], subject to that interruption, and to be restored immediately at the time when they presented themselves for work"² (or an exclusion from the award, of the backwages corresponding to a period of seven years [1961 to 1968] in round figures). On the matter of strike duration pay, Judge Bugayong held that "it sounds reasonable that the trial court has enunciated a mandate that the strikers, considering the adverse attitude of its employer, were not in a position to return to work until such time when the discriminatory acts were in due time rectified by the employer" and hence voted for payment of strike duration pay in the same manner as the backwages for the dismissed petitioners-employees.

The fifth judge Ansberto P. Paredes filed his concurring and dissenting opinion dated *July 10, 1968* recognizing "the gravity of the offense of respondents and the resultant damage and prejudice to individual complainants found to be victims but voted as a matter of equity" that the period commencing one year (in view of the voluminous records, this is the reasonable length of time the case should have been decided) after the time this case was submitted for decision on October 25, 1961 up to the time the Court *en banc* shall have promulgated its resolution on the motion for reconsideration of the Decision of the trial court dated September 6, 1966, should not be included in the award" (or an exclusion from the award, of the backwages corresponding to a period of six years [1962 to 1968] in round figures. He voted against any award of strike duration pay on the ground that this was not pleaded nor prayed for in the unfair labor practice complaint.

In short, while all the five judges sustained the findings of the trial court on respondents' unfair labor practices and discriminatory acts which justified petitioner-union's strike and all voted in favor of reinstatement and of the strikers' return to work, only three judges voted to award

²Notes in brackets supplied.

backwages *without deduction* but in varying periods as above stated (with two of them excluding certain periods thus modifying the trial judge's award of backwages from dismissal to reinstatement) while two judges voted against any award of backwages. On the award of strike-duration pay to the strikers, two judges voted to grant strike duration pay while three voted against any such award.

Both parties sought to appeal from respondent court's decision and resolution *en banc* to this Court.

Respondents' petition for review was docketed as L-29331³ on *August 5, 1968* and was denied due course per this Court's resolution of *August 9, 1968* "for being factual and for lack of merit" and resolution of *September 18, 1968* denying reconsideration and entry of judgment was entered on *September 26, 1968*.

Respondents' petition before this Court in said case L-29331 raised the following specific issues:

"(a) Whether or not an award for an unconditional reinstatement is proper and just where the nature of the business of respondent employees requires not only medical examination prior to admission for work, but a periodic medical check-up as a condition for continued employment?

"(b) Whether or not an award for full backwages to certain workers from the date of their dismissal up to the time of their actual reinstatement is fair, equitable and just where there has been no findings on the nature of the employment of the workers concerned?

In their discussion of their petition, respondents further claimed that reinstatement of petitioners was not feasible because they had closed their Davao plant on *October 16, 1966* due to alleged huge losses from 1964 to 1966—an allegation made by them for the first time *after* respondent court *en banc* had denied reconsideration in July 1968 and which had never been timely nor properly raised by them as an issue in their pleadings nor at the trial held by respondent court. As already indicated above, respondents' petition was denied by this Court "for being *factual and for lack of merit*."

The question of the dismissed petitioners-employees' right to reinstatement with backwages without deduction as awarded by respondent court and of the petitioner-union's/striking members' right to return to work is thus already a settled matter, respondent court's action in this regard having been *affirmed* by this Court's denial of respondents' petition for review in L-29331. Such denial of their petition in L-29331 equally settled and barred their belated contention therein that the reinstatement and return of the petitioner-union's dismissed employees and

³ Entitled "7-Up Bottling Co. of the Phil., et al., vs. C.I.R., et al."

striking members was not feasible due to their alleged closure of their Davao plant in 1966 which closure was without respondent court's authorization and in *violation* of its judgment ordering reinstatement and return to work of the workers.

The only remaining questions submitted for the Court's resolution are the two questions raised by petitioners in their petition, viz, that the "duration of the period for backwages . . . should not be shortened in view of the gravity of respondents' offense and the resultant damage and prejudice to said workers" and that "the striking members of petitioning union are clearly entitled to strike duration pay."⁴

The petition is meritorious and should be granted.

I. On the matter of payment of *full backwages* to the wrongfully dismissed petitioners-employees from date of dismissal to reinstatement without exclusion of any period during which the case was pending determination by respondent court, the following vital considerations support petitioners' stand:

1. As soon as this Court's resolution denying respondents' separate appeal in Case L-29331 from respondent court's decision became final in September, 1968, petitioners filed under date of November 2, 1968 with respondent court their motion for *execution* of its decision of September 5, 1966 as affirmed with modification by the *en banc* resolution of July 10, 1968 ordering the reinstatement with backwages of the nine wrongfully dismissed employees and for the return to work of the striking members of petitioner union.

Respondents however obstinately but successfully *opposed* in their pleading dated *November 21, 1968*⁵ the reinstatement and return of the workers on the ground that the matter of the amount of backwages was appealed by petitioners through the present case to this Court and contended erroneously that petitioners thereby waived the benefits of the rule on non-stay of execution of judgment.

A second ground of respondents' opposition to the motion for execution was an entirely *new* and *unpleaded* matter, viz, that "the matter of reinstatement can no longer be effected there having been closure (allegedly since October 16, 1966) of the Davao branch office due to financial reverses." This alleged closure was raised by respondents for the first time in respondent court, as far as the record shows, only in their said opposition of November 21, 1968, *after* respondent court had denied in

⁴ Petition, par. VIII.

⁵ Rollo, pp. 181-201.

July, 1968 reconsideration of its decision and this Court had denied in September, 1968 respondents' separate appeal from respondent court's judgment in question.

2. As already indicated above, in their petition in L-29331 by way of separate appeal from respondent court's judgment ordering reinstatement with backwages and return to work of the strikers, respondents for the *first* time made the claim that reinstatement was not feasible because of their alleged unilateral closure of the Davao plant on October 16, 1966 which closure they undertook at their own instance and risk and without court authorization notwithstanding the rendition of judgment ordering them to reinstate the dismissed and striking members of petitioner union. Petitioners accordingly assailed respondents in their motion to dismiss dated August 24, 1968 in opposition to respondents' petition in L-29331, averring that "this allegation was made for the first time only after the respondent court *en banc* had denied, in July, 1968, the above-mentioned motion for reconsideration of the decision filed by respondent employer. Hence, for the same reasons above-mentioned, such a question may not be properly raised on appeal before this Honorable Court. Moreover, the closure was resorted to in bad faith and in order to circumvent the order of reinstatement which had been received by the respondent employer beforehand." ⁶

This Court's denial of their said petition in L-29331 has settled and foreclosed in this case their belated contention that their unilateral closure of the Davao plant has made reinstatement and return of the workers "not feasible". In point of fact, respondents apparently concede this for outside of their answer, they have not raised the question alleged closure of the Davao plant in their brief and even acknowledged therein while raising some question as to whether it is "proper and practicable," that reinstatement and return to work may be enforced at their main plant at Parañaque, Rizal. ⁷

3. This Court's denial of respondents' separate petition by way of appeal in L-29331 from the judgment at bar equally forecloses any dispute in the case at bar (since their contrary contentions were already rejected therein) as to the judgment which has ordered the reinstatement of the nine dismissed employees with full backwages *without deduction or qualification* from date of their respective unlawful dismissal until the date of their actual reinstatement and the acceptance of the return to work of the

⁶ Rollo in L-29331, pp. 108-109.

⁷ Rollo, pp. 176, 201.

striking members of petitioner union whose strike was upheld to be just and legal as a measure of self-defense and protection against respondents' union-busting activities.

The judgment of backwages comprises a period from 1957 (the year of dismissal) up to the present year 1974 since the workers' attempts to enforce the judgment by execution and to be reinstated and to return to work have been obstinately and successfully resisted by respondents up to now.

Respondents cannot now be heard to complain since it is they who have blocked all attempts of the workers at reinstatement and return to work, *notwithstanding* the *finality* of the judgment in *this* aspect since the denial in September, 1968 of their separate appeal in Case L-29331.

As the Court has stressed in *East Asiatic Co. Ltd. vs. CIR*,^{*} "it is implicit in the law that what the court should have done as the initial step was to order *immediate implementation* of the ordered reinstatement, without prejudice to resolving the question of backwages afterwards. In that manner, all of these questions vexing the parties and the court could have been avoided or at least minimized. After all, it is the *long lay-off* that creates problems not only for the employer, with regard to *how much* has to be paid in *backwages*, but also, and this is worse, for the discharged employee or worker, as to whom naturally the damage is always bound to be beyond complete repair since during the uncertain period of lay-off, he and his family have to undergo the difficulties, hardships and vicissitudes of unemployment until he can have some kind of earning elsewhere. On the other hand, with immediate reinstatement upon the court's finding of *just* and *legal ground* therefor *no injury* is caused to either employer or employee, for the former gets the benefit of the latter's work and the latter receives due compensation therefor. The obvious advantages of this arrangement in terms of industrial peace and economic and social progress, and the larger interest of the nation as a whole, are incalculable."

4. The question *directly* raised by the nine dismissed petitioners-employees as far as their backwages are concerned is whether the backwages corresponding to the period of *six to seven* years (in round figures) that the case was *pending* decision by respondent court from date of submittal on *October 25, 1961* through the date of the trial court's decision on *September 5, 1966* until the release of said court's *en banc* resolution and denial with

^{*} 40 SCRA 521, 533, cited in *NASSCO vs. CIR*, 57 SCRA 642 (June 28, 1974).

modification of the motion for reconsideration on *July 10, 1968* should be excluded from the backwages award. Respondent court's award of backwages *without deduction or qualification* was *not* questioned by respondents in their separate appeal in L-29331 and this Court's denial of their petition therein in September, 1968 has at any rate foreclosed this matter (in fact, respondents raise no question concerning the same in their brief in the case at bar).

As already stated above, two other judges concurred with the trial judge in awarding full backwages *without deduction or qualification* from dismissal to reinstatement. Judge Bugayong however qualified his concurrence by voting to exclude a period of *seven* years (from October 25, 1961 date of submittal for decision "to be restored immediately" on November 2, 1968 after the decision when the workers presented themselves unsuccessfully for work), while Judge Paredes was for excluding from the backwages award a period of *six* years (from October 25, 1962 [one year after submittal for decision] to July 1968, when respondent court *en banc* resolved respondents' motion for reconsideration).

Both of the latter two, Judges Bugayong and Paredes, voted for the exclusion of the backwages corresponding to the period of six to seven years that the case was pending determination by respondent court on the sole ground of the long pendency of the case before their court, with Judge Bugayong rationalizing that "respondent company, no matter how guilty it was for the unfair labor practices committed against its employees . . . should not be made to sacrifice and compensate for damages occasioned by the long pendency of this case after its submission which was anyway beyond its control. The court must also take a share of its fault and be willing to admit the blame for the long pendency of this case."⁹

Such reasoning on which respondents mainly relied in their brief¹⁰ is however fallacious for it completely ignores the fact that respondent company was found guilty of the grossest form of oppressive and unfair labor practices, discriminatory acts and union-busting activities against petitioners as the aggrieved parties and must bear the full consequences of its acts particularly in the light of its obstinacy in persisting in its refusal to reinstate the unlawfully dismissed nine employees and accept the returning strikers *notwithstanding* that its appeal to this Court in L-29331 had been rejected in September, 1968. Such a favoring of the offender-employer as against the aggrieved workers would not be in consonance with the constitutional

⁹ Rollo, page 135.

¹⁰ Respondents' brief, pp. 2-8.

mandate that the State afford protection to labor¹¹ and the statutory injunctions against the employer's unfair labor practices¹² and oppressive acts against labor.¹³ While the judge would have respondent court take a share of its fault for the long pendency of the case, this should not be done however at the expense and to the prejudice of the aggrieved workers who should be duly indemnified for their lost earnings as a direct result of their illegal dismissal and to the favor and advantage of the offender-employer.

5. The minority's (Judges Martinez and Tabigne) view that the dismissed and striking members of petitioner union should first undergo a medical examination before they are reinstated or allowed to return to work was the first of two issues raised by respondents in their separate appeal in Case L-29331, *supra*.¹⁴ This issue was settled and foreclosed by this Court's rejection in September, 1968 of respondents' said appeal.

At any rate, respondent court correctly followed established principles in not adhering to the minority view of requiring medical examination as a *condition precedent* for reinstatement or return to work. The filing and pendency of an unfair labor practice case as in the case at bar presupposes a *continuing* employer-employee relationship¹⁵ and when the case is decided in favor of the workers, this relationship is in law deemed to have continued uninterruptedly notwithstanding their unlawful dismissal or the lawful strike and stoppage of work, and hence, seniority and other privileges are preserved in their favor. To require them to undergo a physical or medical examination as a precondition of reinstatement or return to work simply because of the long pendency of their case which is due to no fault of theirs would not only defeat the purpose of the law and the constitutional and statutory mandates to protect labor but would work to their unfair prejudice as aggrieved parties and give an undue advantage to employers as the offenders who have the means and resources to wage attrition and withstand the bane of protracted litigation.

Hence, the aggrieved workers may be subjected to periodic physical or medical examination as *old reinstated* workers, but *not* as a *precondition* to their reinstatement or return to work—with the important consequence that if they are found to be ill or suffering from some

¹¹ Art. XIV, sec. 6, 1935 Constitution; Art. II, sec. 9, 1973 Constitution.

¹² R.A. 875, sec. 4(a).

¹³ Art. 1701, Civil Code.

¹⁴ At page 10 hereof.

¹⁵ R.A. 875, section 2(a).

disability, they would be entitled to all the benefits that the laws and company practices provide by way of compensation, medical care, disability benefits and gratuities, etc. to employees and workers.

II. On the matter of payment of *strike-duration pay* to the striking members of petitioner union whose strike was upheld by respondent court to be justified and legal, the Court finds that respondents' unfair labor practices and discriminatory practices to the extent of unlawfully dismissing the nine petitioners, coercing the members of petitioner union to join another union obviously sponsored by it and threatening to virtually lock them out and "to shut up Davao plant, if necessary fully justify the trial court's original decision ordering respondents to allow the return to work of the striking members of petitioner union and to give strike duration pay with deduction of earnings elsewhere, without loss of seniority and other benefits granted by the company.

1. While *all* five judges of respondent court concurred that the petitioners' strike was fully justified on account of the company's discriminatory practices, Judges Martinez and Tabigne who subscribed to the trial court's principle "that the strikers are not bound to offer a return to work until such time when the discriminatory acts have been corrected by the employer and if possible, rectified . . . indeed . . . (as) a just one"¹⁶ nevertheless voted against the granting of strike duration pay (and backwages for the unlawfully dismissed petitioners) on *vague* grounds "of wielding our discretionary authority so as to be consistent with justice and equity" and resolving their doubt as "to the necessity of awarding backwages and strike duration pay" in favor of the employer just as "in criminal law, the doubt is always resolved in favor of the accused."¹⁷ They were joined by the negative vote of Judge Paredes who voted against the granting of strike duration pay on the ground that this matter has neither been raised nor pleaded nor prayed for in the complaint",¹⁸ to form a majority of three against the affirmative votes of the trial judge and Judge Bugayong for the granting of strike duration pay.

The trial court's award of strike duration pay less earnings must be sustained as urged by petitioners. The self-same considerations of the company's unfair labor practices and discriminatory acts and anti-union activities that fully justify the award of backwages to the unlawfully dismissed employees equally justify the grant-

¹⁶ Rollo, page 126.

¹⁷ Rollo, pp. 128-129.

¹⁸ *Idem*, p. 137.

ing of strike duration pay to petitioner union's members who were left no other alternative by their employer's improper and oppressive conduct but to declare a strike to render aid and protection to themselves and their unlawfully dismissed companions.¹⁹

The detail that the number and names of the striking members of petitioner union were not specified in the decision nor in the complaint is no consequence as against the established fact that all members of the petitioner union went on strike on August 6, 1957 due to the respondent's unfair labor practices and anti-union activities, *inter alia* unlawfully dismissing the nine petitioners-members, foisting their own favored union on the workers together with a ready-made collective bargaining agreement and announcing a lockout and threatening the closure of the Davao plant. It is the function precisely of a labor union such as petitioner to carry the representation of its members particularly against the employer's unfair labor practices against it and its members and to file an action for their benefit and behalf without joining them and to avoid the cumbersome procedure of joining each and every member as a separate party (as authorized under Rule 3, section 3).²⁰ The petitioner union is thus authorized to ask for execution in due course of the strike duration pay as awarded on behalf of its members and the court *a quo* in the course of implementation and execution of the judgment may call upon the union as well as the striking members and the company's payrolls for the proper verification of the individual members entitled to receive the strike duration pay as awarded.

2. On the procedural question raised by Judge Paredes that the strike duration pay was not raised or prayed for in the original unfair labor practice complaint filed (on July 26, 1957) *before* the strike (declared on August 6, 1957), the Court is satisfied from the record that the issue of the legality and validity of the strike and of the right of the strikers to backwages or more precisely strike duration pay was duly joined and properly litigated by the parties in the trial below.

Respondents themselves in both their answer of August 19, 1957²¹ to the complaint below and amended answer of December 17, 1958²² put in issue the legality of the strike

¹⁹ See *McLeod & Co. of the Phil. vs. Progressive Federation of Labor*, 97 Phil. 205.

²⁰ See *National Brewery & Allied Industries Labor Union vs. San Miguel Brewery*, 9 SCRA 847, cited in *Liberty Mfg. Workers Union vs. CFI of Bulacan*, 48 SCRA 273.

²¹ Petition, Annex "B", Rollo, pp. 22-27.

²² Petition, Annex "D", Rollo, pp. 30-35.

and prayed "that the strike and picket be declared illegal." The parties introduced their respective evidence on the issue and respondents in their memorandum of September 19, 1961 prayed of respondent court, *inter alia* "5. To re-admit all the members of the complainant union who were on strike since August 6, 1957 by reason of the respondents' lock-out and other unfair labor practices, with backwages."

III. The Court therefore grants the petition and as prayed for sets aside the majority *en banc* resolution of respondent court and reinstates the decision and judgment of the trial court of September 5, 1966,²³ subject to the following three modifications:

1. Part(a) of the said judgment ordering the reinstatement of the nine dismissed petitioners "to their former and equivalent positions with full backwages from dates of their respective dismissals until they are actually reinstated" without qualification or deduction is hereby reinstated, *provided* that such backwages shall be computed and paid only up to the date of finality and entry of this judgment.

As already indicated above,²⁴ this Court's denial of respondents' separate appeal in L-29331 from the same judgment at bar forecloses any dispute in the case at bar and the application of the precedent in *Mercury Drug Co. vs. CIR*²⁵ of fixing an amount of net backwages to relieve the employers from proving or disproving the employees' earnings elsewhere during the latter's lay-off and the employees from the same burden (for purposes of deducting the same from the award of gross backwages) which usually resulted in protracted delay to the prejudice of the employees—since here the award was for the payment of *full backwages without* deduction or qualification and respondents' appeal therefrom was already turned down by this Court as *without merit* in September, 1968.

There is thus imposed here an element of *punitive* damages against respondent employer by way of example and for the public good. Due to respondent-employers' obstinacy in not reinstating the unlawfully dismissed employees, notwithstanding that the judgment had become *final* with the failure of their separate appeal since September, 1968, they will now have to pay a record full back-

²³ *Supra*, at pages 7-8.

²⁴ *Supra*, at pages 13-16.

²⁵ L-23357, Apr. 30, 1974, applied in *NASSCO vs. CIR*, L-31852 & L-32724, June 28, 1974, *Almira vs. B.F. Goodrich Phil. Inc.*, L-34974, July 25, 1974, and *Phil. Rock Products, Inc. vs. PAFLU, et al.*, L-32829, August 30, 1974.

wages without qualification surpassing the almost sixteen years of such backwages paid in the recent case of *NASSCO vs. CIR* ²⁶ owing also to the employer's obstinacy and aversion to reinstating the employee in said case notwithstanding the finality of the judgment for reinstatement.

Here, respondents' obstinacy has further been compounded by their questionable act (to say the least, when it is noted that they were found guilty of threatening "to shut up Davao plant, if necessary" in order to discourage the workers' union membership with petitioner and to bust petitioner union) of *not* raising with respondent court during the two years (1966-1968) that their motion for reconsideration was *pending* their alleged unilateral closure of their Davao plant on *October 16, 1966* for alleged huge losses from 1964 to 1966 and to seek its sanction therefor. Instead it was only *after* their motion for reconsideration had been *denied* by respondent court that they used the alleged closure since October 1966 of their Davao plant to claim in their separate appeal *in 1968* in L-29331 to this Court that reinstatement and return of the workers were no longer feasible because of such closure, and when their appeal was nonetheless *rejected* by this Court, to make the same claim with respondent court to block obstinately but successfully the reinstatement and return to work of the workers. Hence, petitioners' claim that such closure was "resorted to in bad faith and in order to circumvent the order of reinstatement." ²⁷

Such alleged unilateral closure of the Davao plant cannot of course be availed of to defeat in this case the final judgment for reinstatement and payment of full backwages to the nine unlawfully dismissed petitioners-employees from dates of their dismissal up to the date of finality and entry of this judgment, as now fixed by the Court. Otherwise, respondents would be able to do indirectly what they could not do directly and unlawfully dismiss the workers and evade judgment by the mere *unilateral* closure without justifiable cause of their Davao plant. ²⁸

2. What about the implementation of the final judgment for reinstatement (and for acceptance back to work of the strikers whose strike was found to be just and lawful, as per part (b) of the trial court's judgment herein reinstated) and its provision for the continuation of payment of backwages until actual reinstatement?

The Court, due to the unjustified suppression by respondents from respondent court during the pendency for two

²⁶ See fn. 25 for citation.

²⁷ *Supra*, at page 12.

²⁸ See *Aronson & Co. Inc. vs. Associated Labor Union*, 40 SCRA 7. 084766—4

years (1966–1968) of their motion for reconsideration of the alleged closure since 1966 of their Davao plant and the failure of their separate appeal in L-29331 wherein they invoked such closure for the *first* time, therefore considers as a matter of equity that notice of such closure and proper application to close its Davao plant and to be relieved from the effects of the adverse judgment (although no such application appears in the record to have been actually filed by respondents) has been filed only *now* by respondent employer.

Since this is an entirely *new* matter on which the parties make separate claims with petitioners claiming it is a mere device in *bad faith* to escape the judgment and respondents claiming it to be a *legitimate* decision to avoid huge losses, this matter will have to be *remanded* for further proceedings, as in *Columbian Rope Co. of the Phil. vs. Tacloban Ass'n. of Laborers*²⁹ to receive evidence on and decide the following questions: (a) whether the closure of the Davao plant is for a *justifiable cause*, as alleged by respondents or is resorted to in order to *circumvent* the judgment for reinstatement of the nine unlawfully dismissed petitioners-employees and return to work of the striking members of petitioner union, whose strike has been found to be just and lawful, as alleged by petitioners; (b) if the closure is found to be *justified*, whether or not on the basis of the evidence, it is feasible (and acceptable to the workers) to order the reinstatement and return to work of the employees in respondent company's *main* plant at Parañaque, Rizal or *other* branches, if any, nearest to the closed Davao plant or to put them on a *preferential waiting list* for that purpose, on the basis of the exigencies of its business; (c) if the closure is found to be *unjustified* to determine the most practical and expeditious means to enforce reinstatement and return to work of the workers; and (d) in either case, whether or not the closure is found to be justified, whether the payment of backwages with or without deduction to the unlawfully dismissed employees shall still *continue* after the date of finality of this judgment or shall *cease*, considering the substantial backwages without deduction awarded under the judgment at bar to said employees.

3. Part (b) of the trial court's judgment ordering respondents to allow the return to work of the striking members of petitioner union with strike duration pay "from the *date of the strike* (August 6, 1957) up to the *receipt of the decision* (of September 5, 1966)" less earnings elsewhere earned by the strikers in the form of salaries

²⁹ 6 SCRA 425, 430, per Makalintal, now C.J.

or wages is hereby reinstated as prayed for by petitioners, *provided* however that following the precedent of the *Mercury Drug Co.* case, *supra*,³⁰ the Court in the light of the circumstances of record in the case at bar, hereby fixes the strike duration pay for the period of over nine years (August 6, 1957 to September 5, 1966) without going through the protracted process of determining the amount of such earnings elsewhere, at the equivalent of five (5) years wages *net* without deduction and qualification as the just and reasonable amount payable to the said employees.

ACCORDINGLY, judgment is hereby rendered setting aside the majority *en banc* resolution of respondent Court of Industrial Relations insofar as it modified the September 5, 1966 decision of said court which is hereby reinstated, subject to the three modifications thereof as set forth in the preceding Heading III in the body of the opinion. The case is ordered remanded to respondent court for further proceedings as stated in part 2 of said Heading III; however, if respondent court shall no longer be authorized or in a position to act on and determine the questions remanded to it since it is set to be abolished under the new Labor Code scheduled for implementation on November 1, 1974 under Presidential Decree No. 442, then the case shall be ordered remanded for the proceedings and purposes therein stated to the successor-entity of respondent court under the new Labor Code and its implementing regulations. So ORDERED.

Castro, J., Chairman, Makasiar, Esguerra and Muñoz Palma, JJ., concur.

Judgment appealed from and set aside.

³⁰ At page 18.

[No. L-29736. October 31, 1974]

SECOND DIVISION

PHILIPPINE VIRGINIA TOBACCO ADMINISTRATION (PVRTA),
petitioner, *vs.* HON. WALFRIDO DE LOS ANGELES as
Judge of the Court of First Instance of Rizal, Quezon
City Branch IV and ABRA AGRICULTURAL ASSN. INC.,
Bangued, Abra.

*Government Corporate Counsel Leopoldo M. Abellera,
Assistant Government Corporate Counsel Romualdo Valera
and Trial Attorney Eduardo G. Rosario* for the petitioner.

Benito P. Fabie for the respondent Abra Agricultural
Association, Inc.

PETITION for Certiorari with Mandamus.

SYNOPSIS

On the date of the filing of an appeal bond and notice of appeal, petitioner filed a motion for extension of time to file record on appeal, which the trial court failed to act upon within the (30) day period. Nine days after the expiry of the reglementary period, petitioner filed a second "Motion for Extension of Time to File a Record on Appeal" which was impliedly denied by the trial court when it dismissed the appeal interposed by petitioner.

Petition dismissed.

SYLLABUS
of the Ruling of the Court

1. APPEAL; RECORD ON APPEAL; MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF ITS FILING DOES NOT SUSPEND THE RUNNING OF PERIOD FOR APPEAL.—The filing of a motion for extension for the filing of a record on appeal does not interrupt the running of the period for appeal since the only purpose of such motion is to ask the court to grant an enlargement of the time fixed by law.
2. ID.; ID.; ID.; DUTY OF APPELLANT TO VERIFY COURT ACTION.—An appellant has no right to assume that his motion for extension of time to file the record on appeal would be granted and should verify from the court as to the outcome of his motion, so that if the same is denied he can still perfect his appeal within the remaining period.
3. ID.; ID.; ID.; EFFECT OF DISMISSAL OF APPEAL ON SAID MOTION.—If the motion for extension filed within the reglementary period is not acted upon by the court and the extension period lapses without the record on appeal having been filed, the right to appeal is lost.
4. ID.; ID.; ID.; ID.;—The rule that if a motion for extension of period to file record on appeal is granted, the extension requested is tacked to the original period, even if the favorable order is issued after the expiration of the latter does not apply where the motion for extension is never granted.
5. ID.; ID.; ID.; ID.;—The dismissal of the appeal by the judge constitutes a denial of the extension, in which eventuality, the only question that can arise is as to whether or not the trial judge has gravely abused his discretion in denying such extension.
6. ID.; SEC. 3, RULE 41, RULES OF COURT; REASON FOR THE RULE.—Section 3, Rule 41 of the Rules of Court requires that the notice of appeal, the appeal bond, and the record on appeal be filed in Court, and served on the adverse party, within thirty (30) days from notice of judgment, deducting the time when a motion for reconsideration is pending; and compliance with this period for appeal is absolutely indispensable for the prevention of needless delays and to the orderly and speedy discharge of judicial business.
7. APPEAL; APPELLATE COURT ACQUIRES NO JURISDICTION IF PERIOD OF APPEAL IS NOT COMPLIED WITH.—If the period of 30 days provided for in Section 3, Rule 41 is not complied with, the judgment becomes final and executory and the appellate court does not acquire jurisdiction over the appeal.

OPINION OF THE COURT

ANTONIO, J.:

Petition for certiorari with mandamus, to annul the order of respondent Court in Civil Case No. Q-11728 (Abra Agricultural Association, Inc. *vs.* Philippine Virginia Tobacco Administration and Farmers' Virginia Redriers, Inc.), dated October 16, 1968, dismissing the appeal of petitioner for its failure to file the record on appeal within the reglementary period and to compel said Court to give due course to the appeal.

We find the petition unmeritorious.

In dismissing this petition, this Court reaffirms the rule that the filing of a motion for extension of the period for the filing of a record on appeal does not suspend the running of the period for appeal, since the only purpose of such motion is to ask the court to grant an enlargement of the time fixed by law.¹ Evidently, the movant has no right to assume that his motion would be granted and should check with the court as to the outcome of his motion, so that if the same is denied, he can still perfect his appeal within the remaining period.² Thus, if the motion for extension filed within the reglementary period is not acted upon by the court and the extension period asked for lapses without the record on appeal having been filed, the motion does not suspend the period to appeal and the right to appeal is lost.³ It is true that in *Berkenkotter*, We said that if the motion is granted, the extension requested is tacked to the original period, even if the favorable order is issued after the expiration of the latter.⁴ In the case at bar, the motions for extension were never granted.

Thus, petitioner, through the Corporate Counsel, received notice of the judgment of the trial court on June 22, 1968. On July 19, 1968, petitioner filed with the court *a quo* an appeal bond and notice of appeal to the effect that it was appealing the judgment to the Supreme Court. On the same date petitioner also filed a "Motion for Extension of Time to File Record on Appeal," alleging that due to the voluminous records that had to be copied and included in the record on appeal, it may not be able to file the same on time, and asking for extension of fifteen (15) days counted from July 22, 1968. The respondent

¹ *Escolin vs. Garduno*, 57 Phil., 924; *Gov't vs. Abad*, 56 Phil., 504; *Alejandro vs. Endencia*, 64 Phil., 321; *Capinpin vs. Hon. Bonifacio Ysip, et al.*, 106 Phil., 168.

² *Bello vs. Fernando*, 4 SCRA 135.

³ *Cumplido vs. Mendoza*, 11 SCRA 477, 481; *Reyes vs. Sta. Maria*, 48 SCRA 1, 6.

⁴ *Berkenkotter vs. Court of Appeals*, 53 SCRA 228, 233-234.

Court did not act on this motion for extension. Instead of verifying from the Court whether or not its motion for extension was favorably acted upon, petitioner through inaction permitted to the original period of thirty (30) days to lapse on July 22, 1968. On July 31, 1968, or nine (9) days after the expiry of the reglementary period, petitioner filed a second "Motion for Extension of Time to File Record on Appeal." In the aforementioned pleading, petitioner alleged that on July 20, 1968, the other defendant, Farmers' Virginia Tobacco Redriers, Inc. (FVTR) filed a motion for reconsideration of the trial court's decision, and the said motion, together with the Court's resolution thereon,, would necessarily form part of the petitioner's record on appeal, hence, the said record on appeal could not possibly be completed and filed before the resolution of FVTR's motion. The petitioner prayed in its second motion that its period for filing the record on appeal be extended until such time as the FVTR's motion for reconsideration shall have been resolved finally, and that it be given ten (10) days from its receipt of the Court's resolution within which to file its record on appeal. This was opposed by private respondent on September 11, 1968, said party alleging that the second motion for extension filed by the PVTa was not meritorious as whatever action the Court may take on FVTR's motion for reconsideration would not be material to the appeal of petitioner, since the said motion for reconsideration referred only to the portion of the decision ordering FVTR to reimburse the PVTa whatever amount the latter had been adjudged to pay private respondent. Private respondent likewise alleged that the filing of the motion was purely dilatory.

After the petitioner filed its reply to private respondent's motion of September 19, 1968, the trial Court issued an order on October 16, 1968, which, among others, reads as follows:

"* * * It will be noted that the opposition of the plaintiff for the extension of the period to file the record on appeal by the said defendant PVTa was centered on the second motion for extension which prayed for an indefinite period. In the opposition filed by the plaintiff against the said extensions of time, it was likewise prayed that the appeal interposed by the defendant PVTa be now dismissed on the ground that the period to appeal has already elapsed and that the same is purely for purposes of delay and dilatory tactics. Subsequently, plaintiff presented a supplemental allegations and/or arguments to support the motion to dismiss appeal. Plaintiff alleged in the said supplemental pleading that the evidence on record strongly and firmly support the claim of the plaintiff, consisting as they do, mainly of testimonies and documents

originating from defendant PVTA itself, such as (a) the testimony of Mr. Quirico T. Samonte, head of the PVTA Trading Department, favorable to plaintiff's claim coupled with his certification dated March 18, 1965 (Exh. R), attesting to the tobacco shipments subject of the claim; (b) the letter of Mr. Federico B. Moreno, PVTA Officer-in-Charge, to the Auditor General dated January 9, 1968 (Exh. DD), stating that the tobacco shipments in question come under the original allocation of defendant FVTR (Exh. DD-1); and (c) Resolution No. 241 of the PVTA Board of Directors, dated August 28, 1964 (Exh. CC), requiring the PVTA to pay tobacco shipments beyond the original two million kilo allocation; that even the Government Corporate Counsel himself, as counsel for the defendant PVTA, in his letter dated July 2, 1968 to the Officer-in-Charge of said defendant stated as follows:

'In the light of the evidence presented in the case, including ours, as well as the circumstances obtaining in the instant case, we feel that an appeal from the decision rendered in this case would not prosper and would only entail waste of time and effort and at considerable expense considering that interest will continue to run on the principal amount due until the same is paid and considering that it will take at least two or three years before the appeal would be resolved.'

The appeal therefore being taken now by the same counsel for the PVTA could be considered as manifestly and palpably frivolous and dilatory.

"In view of the foregoing, the appeal interposed by the defendant PVTA is hereby ordered dismissed for failure to file the record on appeal within the reglementary period. The second motion for extension of time praying for an indefinite suspension of the period to file the record on appeal could not be considered by the Court, the running of the period within which to perfect an appeal could not be suspended by the Court, hence the period within which defendant PVTA must perfect its appeal has already expired; and, even assuming that defendant PVTA was able to perfect the appeal within the period, yet the same must necessarily be dismissed for being patently frivolous and a dilatory tactic to delay the termination of this case."

Petitioner claims that respondent judge committed grave abuse of discretion amounting to excess of jurisdiction in dismissing its appeal because (a) it had seasonably filed the motion for extension of time to file its record on appeal based on valid grounds, which motion respondent judge failed to resolve; (b) respondent judge is empowered to grant extensions of time to file records on appeal in meritorious cases, as in this case, where the completion of the record on appeal must necessarily await resolution of the FVTR's motion for reconsideration, the inclusion of which in the record on appeal is necessary so as to avoid multiplicity of suit; and (c) appeal of the petitioner cannot be considered as frivolous and dilatory.

As already stated, petitioner's second motion for extension was filed nine (9) days after the expiry of the reglementary period granted by Section 3 of Rule 41 of the Revised Rules of Court. It is true petitioner filed a "Motion for Extension of Time to File a Record on Appeal"

on July 19, 1968, but it had no right to assume that the same could be granted. It was petitioner's duty to take steps to verify from the Court whether or not its motion for extension had been granted, considering that its time was running out.

Petitioner contends that it was erroneous on the part of the trial court to hold that its second motion for extension of time to file the record on appeal, which in effect was a motion to suspend the running of said period until the motion for reconsideration of the other defendant shall have been acted upon, was late because "the period within which defendant PVTa must perfect its appeal has already expired", because no action had been actually taken by the court on its first motion for extension one way or the other. In this connection, it will be recalled that in *Berkenkotter, supra*, this Court held that the approval by the trial judge of the record on appeal, even if made after the period for the appeal has already expired, is tantamount to a valid order granting the extension prayed for by appellant, if any such motion has been filed. We now hold that conversely, the dismissal of the appeal by the judge constitutes a denial of the extension, in which eventuality, the only question that can arise is as to whether or not the trial judge has gravely abused his discretion in denying such extension. In the circumstances of the present case, it has not been sufficiently shown that there was such a grave abuse of discretion.

We have always emphasized that Section 3, Rule 41, of the Rules, "requires that the notice of appeal, the appeal bond, and the record on appeal be all filed in court, and served on the adverse party, within thirty (30) days from notice of judgment, deducting the time when a motion for reconsideration is pending; and compliance with this period for appeal is considered absolutely indispensable for the prevention of needless delays and to the orderly and speedy discharge of judicial business (*Altavas Conlu vs. C.A., L-14027, January 29, 1960*), so that if said period is not complied with, the judgment becomes final and executory and the appellate Court does not acquire jurisdiction over the appeal (*Layda vs. Legaspi, 38 Phil., 83; Pamplona vs. Suiza, 12 Phil., 99; Caisip vs. Cabangon, L-14684, Aug. 26, 1960*)."⁵

WHEREFORE, the petition is dismissed, with costs against petitioner.

Fernando, J., Chairman, Barredo, Fernandez, and Aquino, JJ., concur.

Petition dismissed.

⁵ *Bell vs. Fernando*, 4 SCRA, 135, 138.

MGA HATOL NG HUKUMAN NG MGA PAGHAHABOL
(DECISIONS OF THE COURT OF APPEALS)

RICARDO G. DE LEON, CHIEF, REPORTER'S DIVISION

[No. 50249-R.* June 17, 1974]**

BELLA RITA YAN, petitioner and appellee, *vs.* JOSEFA
LIWANAG LIWAG, ET AL., oppositors and appellants.

1. HOLOGRAPHIC WILLS; PHRASE "EXPLICITLY DECLARE" IN ART. 811, CIVIL CODE, ITS INTERPRETATION.—The words "explicitly declare" in Art. 811 of the New Civil Code were intentionally placed by the lawmakers and mean that in contested cases of holographic wills, three witnesses must precisely, exactly, definitely, unconditionally, positively, declare that the totality of the will was in the handwriting of testator.
2. ID.; AUTHORITY OF APPELLATE COURT TO EXAMINE AND COMPARE HANDWRITING AND SIGNATURE WITH ADMITTED HANDWRITINGS AND SIGNATURES OF DECEDENT.—In the probate of contested holographic wills, the appellate court may examine and compare the handwriting and signature of the testator appearing in the will with those of his admitted handwritings and signatures, and make its own findings different from those of the handwriting expert and the trial court.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Court of First Instance
of Manila. Federico C. Alikpala, *J.*

The facts are stated in the opinion of the Court.

Francisco S. Dixon and *Tomas Yumol* for oppositors and
appellants.

Dominguez, Marin and *Sto. Domingo* for petitioner and
appellee.

GATMAITAN, *J.*:

Appeal in Civil Case No. 78223 CFI Manila, for probate
of will in which after filing of petition on 14 November,
1969 and posterior proceedings, including 2 oppositions
and trial on the merits, there was promulgated decision
disposing.

"WHEREFORE, the Court declares the document marked Exhibit D
to be a holographic will of the decedent Librada E. Liwanag, and
having been executed in accordance with the formalities prescribed
by law, the same is hereby allowed and admitted to probate.

The deed of extrajudicial settlement executed by and among the
heirs of Librada E. Liwanag dated November 11, 1968 is hereby
set aside and declared of no further force and effect insofar as the
adjudication therein of the house and lot situated at the corner
of Laong Laan and Casañas Street, City of Manila and covered by
Transfer of Certificate of Title No. 46167 to Josefa Liwanag Liwag
and Florentino E. Liwanag, which under the will admitted to probate,
was adjudicated to the sisters Bella Rita Yan and Eden Yan.

SO ORDERED.

Manila, December 20, 1971, p. 61, Joint Record on Appeal;

* Vol. 19 C.A.R. (2s), p.——.

** The case was submitted for decision on 8th August, 1973.

which oppositors have taken here on the errors assigned in their brief;

IT RESULTING: That most of the antecedents are not disputed; Librada E. Liwanag, single, died on 15 October, 1968 at the Philippine General Hospital, she had 3 brothers and 3 sisters, named, Florentino, Iñigo, Primo, Josefa, Matilde, and Rita,—but of these, 3 have died before her, namely, Iñigo, Primo, and Rita; but have left their children; the Court gathers that she was from Pakil, Laguna, but established herself in Manila, studied High School, and then engaged in business, selling to local newspapers, publication rights to comic strips from foreign newspapers, under business name, “Manila Press Features”; that was since 1953; first in backyard of a residence of her brother in law, Alejandro Yan at Instruccion St., later in Alcazar Bldg., in Estero Cegado, then in Maria Dolores Bldg. in Azcarraga, and finally in a house and lot bought by her at corner of Laong-Laan and Casañas Sts., Sampaloc, the 2nd story being used as her residence; she fell ill in January, 1968, was taken to Marian Hospital in February, and transferred to PGH in March where she was confined until she died on 15 October, 1968, and present petition was filed on 14 November, 1969 by her niece Bella Rita Yan, thru her sister, Matilde, seeking to probate handwritten document, Exhibit D, reading,

“Jan. 18, 1967

“Today is my birthday and for my goodwill to my nieces Bella and Eden, nieces to my sister Eding side I hereby given them, my house and lot, 2122 Laong Laan and Casañas, Sampaloc, Manila, all the furnishings, TV, Stereo, Refrigerator, Beds (Sylcon) and the glasswares belong to those two sisters, Bella and Eden in case of my death.

(Sgd.) Librada E. Liwanag”

on paper with letterhead of Manila Press Features; now petition was opposed by her sister, Josefa, her brother, Florentino, by her nephews thru her pre-deceased brother, Iñigo, named, Benjamin, Jaime and Renato surnamed Liwanag, and by her nephews thru her other pre-deceased sister, Rita, named, Gertrudo and Artemio Pulutan, on the main ground that Exhibit D was not her will, in fact, that her legal heirs had already entered into an extrajudicial partition of her estate on 11 November, 1968,—and in the trial, petitioner sought to sustain her position with evidence to the effect that, as recited by trial Judge,

“In the morning of her birthday on January 18, 1968, Librada made (6) holographic wills on separate pieces of memorandum stationery of the Manila Press Features, wherein she wrote in her own handwriting to whom her properties would be distributed upon her death, three of which read as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Jan. 18, 1967

Today is my birthday and for my goodwill to my nieces Bella and Eden, nieces to my sister Eding side I hereby given them, my house and lot, 2122 Laong Laan and Casañas, Sampaloc, Manila all the furnishings, TV, Stereo, Refrigerator, Beds (Sylcon) and the glasswares belong to these two sisters, Bella and Eden in case of my death.

(Sgd.) Librada E. Liwanag

EXHIBIT E

Jan. 18, 1967

I am giving my house and lot in Pakil to Lulu, the only child of Inot, my brother. Her full name is Lourdes S. Liwanag. Boy or Mario and Nene (Susana) Liwanag should always be kind to her as she is all by herself. Love her always and respect your Ate Lulu.

(Sgd.) Librada E. Liwanag

EXHIBIT F

I am hereby giving Dana my kaingin lanzonesan located at the deposito ng tubig sa Ibaba. You can get the land title from my box bought in Hongkong. Kindly pray for me always, Love.

(Sgd.) Librada E. Liwanag

The six (6) pieces of papers were placed in their respective envelope with the name of the party to whom it was intended written on the face thereof.

Emilio Rance and his wife were invited to the birthday celebration of Librada Liwanag on January 18, 1967, and they arrived in her house at about 11:00 in the morning. After partaking of the lunch, Emilio Rance was called by Librada E. Liwanag to her room and while they were alone, the latter took from a small box six (6) envelopes which were not yet sealed and told the former to read their contents. Three of the documents Rance read were Exhibits D, E and F, while the other three were of similar nature providing for disposition of other properties of Librada E. Liwanag to her other nephews and nieces upon her death. After reading the documents, they were returned to their respective envelopes, and thereafter placed inside the small box, with Librada E. Liwanag informing Rance that they would be sent and delivered to the corresponding legatee.

Early in the morning of January 18, 1967, before going to her work, Bella Rita Yan called her aunt Librada Liwanag and greeted her on her birthday. In the afternoon of the same day, Librada Liwanag sent, thru Benjamin Liwanag, Exhibit D placed inside a sealed envelope to Bella Yan, who received it shortly after her arrival at her residence coming from her place of work at the Philippine General Hospital. Bella opened the envelope, and after reading the contents of Exhibit D, she immediately called by telephone her aunt Librada E. Liwanag and thanked her for it, at the same time telling the latter that it was premature because she was in a good state of health and not going to die. Librada Liwanag replied that it was better to have everything in writing so that there will be no bickering or controversy later after she dies.

During a weekend in the latter part of January, 1967, Librada E. Liwanag went to Pakil, Laguna and there she delivered to Lourdes Liwanag at her residence a sealed envelope on which was written on the front part the nickname 'Lulu', and on the back

of it 'My will', with the last word underscored by two lines. After her aunt had left, Lourdes Liwanag opened the envelope in the presence of her parents and cousins, and she found inside it a document (Exhibit 'E'), wherein she was made the legatee of the house and lot of Librada Liwanag in Pakil, Laguna. Lourdes immediately went to the residence of her aunt and thanked the latter for bequeathing a valuable property to her.

Librada Liwanag fell ill in January of 1968, but it was only on the following month when she entered the Marian Hospital. In March of that year, Librada Liwanag was transferred to the Philippine General Hospital, where she was confined up to the time of her death on October 15, 1968." pp. 42-46, Record on Appeal;

and petitioner presented herself, Emilio Rance, Lourdes Liwanag and Alejandro Yan as witnesses to identify the handwriting in Exhibit D, and as well they did present Mr. Desiderio Pagui, of NBI, asst. director of division on Questioned Documents for the same purposes;

But against this, oppositors, thru witnesses, Josefa Liwanag Liwag, Benjamin Liwanag, and Matilde Liwanag, sought to prove the contrary, that Exhibit D was not in deceased's handwriting and could not have been her true will, and that, in fact, a week after the burial of deceased, a conference was called among her living brother and sisters and nephews and nieces and deceased's safe was opened and in an overnight bag was found the duplicate of a letter in typewritten from which read,

"Nov. 20, 1967

"Jeff,

"Talagang wise iyang kapatid mong si Eds. I cannot forget what she did to me at si Daddy.

"They are laughing at me kung hindi ako kaharap, why should I give property to my pamangkin kapatid muna hindi.

"If I did, just bahala kana parte parte at sa kuarta pati. I can't forget to be treated worse than a muchacha.

(Sgd.) Eds. (Exhibit 5)

Then, on 31 October, 1968, Matilde Liwanag Yan, executed affidavit, Exhibit 3, wherein she stated that she was, "waiving all my rights and privileges to inherit from my deceased sister",

and less than 2 weeks later, on 11 November, 1968, a deed of extra-judicial settlement of the estate Exhibit 1 was made and executed by:

Josefa Liwanag-Liwag	—sister of deceased,
Florentino Liwanag	—brother of deceased,
Matilde Liwanag-Yan	—sister of deceased,—who waived,— participation,
Gertrudo Liwanag-Pulutan,	
Artemio Liwanag-Pulutan,	—children of pre-deceased sister, Rita Liwanag,
Benjamin, Jaime and Renato,	—surnamed Liwanag,—children of pre-deceased brother, Inigo Liwanag,
And Lourdes S. Liwanag,	—child of pre-deceased brother, Primo;

and oppositors sought to point out to certain circumstances which they claimed would show that Exhibit D could not have as it was not, true holographic will of deceased,—

But trial Judge, after hearing the evidence, so held that it was, and ordered probate, annulling furthermore the extra-judicial partition, Exhibit 1,—it is because of this that oppositors have come here and contend, that trial Court erred,

“I . . . in admitting to probate, the document Exhibit D, notwithstanding that the version of petitioner-appellee and the attending circumstances surrounding its alleged execution and delivery cast grave and serious doubts that the said document existed at the time of the death of the deceased Librada Liwanag and that the latter executed it as her holographic will in favor of said petitioner-appellee;

II. . . in holding that the document Exhibit D is in the handwriting and signature of the deceased Librada Liwanag notwithstanding the petitioner-appellee's evidence to prove the handwriting and signature of the said deceased is inherently weak, vague and uncertain and, the testimonies of her witnesses are bias and fraught with incongruities and unnaturalness;

III. . . in considering the testimony of the handwriting expert presented by petitioner-appellee for the purpose of proving the handwriting and signature of the deceased Librada Liwanag in spite of the dubious and insufficient standards used by the said expert and his admission on cross examination and in his report that he only limited his examination to the questioned signature;

IV. . . in holding that the document Exhibit D is a holographic will duly executed in accordance with formalities required by law;

V. . . in annulling the deed of extrajudicial settlement (Exh. I) executed by the heirs on November 11, 1968 inasmuch as it was only acting as a probate court of limited jurisdiction and that the petition for probate of the will did not ask for such a relief. pp. 1-3, Joint Brief for oppositor-appellants;

which can be reduced to the simple question of whether or not on the basis of the evidence and the law, the judgment appealed from should be maintained;

I. CONSIDERING: That a reading of Exhibit D must convince that while the verb “given” is used in the first part, there is however no period after the word, “Manila” but instead there immediately follows the disposition of the furnishings, TV, Stereo, Refrigerator, Bed (Sylcon) and the glassware,—to the same two nieces, Bella and Eden, qualified by the phrase,

“in case of my death,”

this Court is convinced that Exhibit D had been executed *animo testandi*, effective upon death, and since deceased had finished High School, and even had a business requiring her to correspond as she did, in English, with English correspondence in London, Exhibit 9, 11, which must mean that she knew English, and since it was totally handwritten, dated, and signed therefore, Exhibit

D holographic will provided it be shown to have been genuine, that is the vital question; now, after reflecting over oppositors' points elucidated in their brief, this Court has been impressed by certain details,

1st.—The law, Art. 811 New Civil Code, requires that to probate a holographic will,

"It shall be necessary that at least one witness who knows the handwriting and signature of the testator explicitly declare that the will and the signature are in the handwriting of the testator. If the will is contested, at least three of such witnesses shall be required."

and as this Court understands, the word,

"explicitly declare"

was there intentionally placed by lawmakers; and this means, that in contested cases of holographic wills, 3 witnesses must precisely, exactly, definitely, unconditionally, positively, declare that the totality of the will was in the handwriting of Testator; now proponent presented herself; and three witnesses, namely, Lourdes Liwanag-Pascua, Emilio Rance, and Alejandro Yan; according to Lourdes Liwanag, in direct,

"Q.—And because of this fact that you had often times seen her write letters and seen her sign her name, you are familiar with her handwriting and signature?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Kindly go over the same (Exh. D, the will) and tell the Honorable Court if you know whose handwriting is that?

A.—This is my auntie's handwriting, sir.

Q.—There is a signature at the bottom of Exh. D reading, "Librada E. Liwanag," whose signature is that?

A.—That is by Librada E. Liwanag, sir.

Q.—Why do you say that that is the signature of Librada E. Liwanag?

A.—Because I know this is the written will of my auntie and I have a copy of this also." tsn. 1:33, witness, Lourdes Liwanag-Pascua;

according to Emilio Rance,

"Q.—Will you please tell the Honorable Court whose handwriting is this?

A.—This is the handwriting of Miss Librada Liwanag, sir.

Q.—Why do you say that that is the handwriting of Miss Librada Liwanag?

A.—I am familiar with her handwriting since 1949 and since 1953 up to 1966.

Q.—What is the basis of your saying that that is the signature of Miss Librada Liwanag?

A.—I am familiar with her signature, your Honor.

Q.—Well, is there any other basis?

A.—None, Your Honor, just familiar." tsn. 11:14, witness, Emilio Rance.

according to Alejandro Yan,

"Q.—Now, in the while period of 5 years that you worked with her, that is, from 1950 to 1955 and having seen her sign

checks and correspondences which you prepared, would you say that you are familiar with her signature?

A.—Yes, sir, definitely.

Q.—Now, showing to you again this Exh. D, will you go over this said Exh. D and tell the Court whether you recognize whose handwriting that is?

A.—That is her handwriting, sir.

Q.—Why do you say that that is her handwriting?

A.—I remember her faulty writing irregular in nature.

Q.—What are those faulty and irregular features in the handwriting of Miss Librada Liwanag which made you state that that is her handwriting?

A.—I am not a handwriting expert but I know that is the way she wrote, that is, her letter "l" is like an "s" and with a dash usually and most of her "i" have a circle especially the "j" in her signature.

Q.—Now, showing to you again this Exh. D-1 (envelope) kindly look over the same and tell the Honorable Court whose handwriting . . . if you recognize whose handwriting is on the face thereof?

A.—That is her handwriting, sir.

Q.—Why do you say that that is her handwriting?

A.—Her "b's" and "r-s" are always like that." tsn. III; 67, witness, Alejandro Yan;

however, as to petitioner herself, this Court has not seen in her testimony that she had ever identified the will, Exh. D whether handwriting in body, or in signature thereof, except to say that same had been delivered unto her by Benjamin Liwanag in afternoon of 18 January, 1967, at her house in 1265 Instruccion, that she read it, and then called up her aunt, deceased Librada and thanked her; tsn. V:1-12, witness Bella Rita Yan;—

And from foregoing, this Court must see that there is no witnesses ocular, who saw the very act of deceased of writing the holographic will; their testimonies are purely by indirection, because of their familiarity with deceased's handwriting, it is their conclusion that Exh. D was of deceased,—apart from the fact that according to Lourdes, a document, Exh. E giving her a lot in Pakil, Laguna, was given to her by her aunt, deceased Librada, sometime in January, 1967, and according to Rance, in that birthday of deceased on 18 January, 1967, deceased showed him several letters and told him that if she should die, she would have those letters sent to her nieces,—well then, this Court is not very sure that foregoing testimonies absolutely comply with the requirement that the 3 witnesses should,

“explicitly”

declare that the handwriting and signature are of the testatrix; it is the impression of this Court that perhaps the law requires more than a belief, a conclusion, that the said handwriting and signature are the handwriting and signature of testatrix; for it is not enough that the Court,

from the circumstances, believe that the will contained the true last will and testament of deceased, more than that, the law, Art. 811 requires definite, positive precise, affirmation of genuineness of handwriting and signature and perhaps, this can hardly be shown thru inferences;

2nd.—But let this pass, naturally more than foregoing must be the acceptance of veracity of witnesses as to their affirmations, and here, let it be remembered that witness Alejandro Yan is the father of the principal beneficiary in Exh. D, Bella Yan, Lourdes Liwanag is the principal beneficiary in a similar document Exh. E. and as to Emilio Rance, sadly enough, oppositors have shown, rather convincingly, that it could not have been that deceased could have had confidence in Emilio Rance so as to have shown to him these various “letters” referring to Exh. D and the rest of the dispositions, because as shown in Exh. 9, corroborating oppositors’ Proof of lack of confidence by deceased in Emilio Rance, it turns out that on 11 October, 1966, barely 2 months before execution of Exh. D on 18 January, 1967, deceased had manifested that,

“Emilio Rance is no longer with Manila Press Features. He has something done severely and we cannot accept him any more. “Kindly disregard all what he says. He is not an honest employee.”

and the fact that this letter was written by deceased is shown by the reply from London correspondent acknowledging it, Exh. 10 of 17 October, 1966, and again on 17 October, 1966, here we have it that deceased once again wrote to London that,

“... Mr. Emilio Rance was my assistant and I trusted him as I thought he could be sincere to me as I am to him. He had finished his Bachelor of Science in Commerce degree, majoring in accounting through my help. He left my office two days ago, because I found out that he got three of the Syndicates I represent here. ‘I hope you understand how I feel about this. I do not mind very much that Mr. Rance left my office. I think it is for the best of our interest. (Exh. 1);

so that in the face of this written evidence, it becomes very difficult to believe Emilio Rance;

3rd.—But more, much more than foregoing, this Court has examined the handwriting and signature in questioned document, Exh. D as well as the handwriting in envelope, Exh. D-1, and compared the same with handwritings that without question, as petitioner herself had so submitted to the Court and the NBI, were handwritings of deceased, namely, Exh. L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S-1, even those whose originals have not been submitted to the Court but are found in the photograhic enlargements of the NBI, namely, the withdrawal slips from Philippine Trust, Exh. K-1 and K-2 and this Court especially scrutinizing Exh. R and S-1, and Exh. 2, also of deceased,—these three more de-

tailedly because they are not only signatures, but letters and notes in longhand,—without debate of deceased.—this Court can not but form its own conclusion that the true, genuine, real handwriting of deceased, without any exception, are written in *slanting letters*, the distinctive feature of her handwriting according to Beny Liwanag *absolutely different* from the handwriting and signature in Exh. D and the envelope, Exh. D-1, as well as in the other similar documents, Exh. D and F which were no longer submitted for probate; indeed, the NBI witness Mr. Desiderio Pagui had to admit the dissimilarities when examined on the witness stand, t.s.n. 21, Vol. IX; only seeking to explain the discrepancy with the statement that “maybe due to age”, t.s.n. id., p. 23, but note that the last standard, Exh. L-1, is dated 7 June, 1968, even after execution of Exh. D on 18 January, 1967, and the nearest document handwriting by deceased, nearest to the date of the will, is Exh. 2, dated March 3, 1967, and again, this handwritten note.—not merely a signature, is definitely with *slanting letters*; on the other hand, this Court must also admit some validity to oppositors claim that the questioned document, Exh. E as well as the similar documents, Exh. E and F, have rather a striking similarity in handwriting to the long handwritten letters, Exh. 7 and 8 definitely not of deceased but of her sister's;

4th.—And if to this be added that petitioner has not at all apparently challenged the authenticity of the signature in the typewritten note, Exh. 5, see tsn 1:32, admittedly found in deceased's box after her death, already quoted above, Exh. 5,—this Court cannot but entertain rather serious doubts about the truth of Exh. D; so that, following the so strict requirement in Art. 811, the conclusion must have to be one different from that arrived at by trial Court; probate of Exh. D will have to be denied, and consequently also, annulment of extra-judicial partition Exh. I set aside since trial Court was only acting as a probate court, no more, no less;

IN VIEW WHEREOF, this Court is constrained to reverse, as it now reverses, judgment appealed from, no more pronouncement as to costs.

SO ORDERED.

Reyes L. B. and Plana, JJ., concur.

Judgment reversed.

[No. 12186-CR. May 28, 1974]*

THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, plaintiff and appellee,
vs. CHU TIONG *alias* TE LIONG, accused and appellant.

1. INDIRECT CONTEMPT; INCOME TAX RETURNS; REFUSAL TO PRODUCE RETURNS IN COURT AFTER PROMISING TO DO SO; CASE AT BAR.—The accused failed to bring his income tax returns, as promised by him, to show that he had no funds with which to pay the judgment debt. Upon the suggestion of the creditor and over his counsel's objection, accused signed an authority for the creditor to secure his income tax returns from the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The creditor sought to obtain the income tax returns of accused but failed to do so as the Bureau required a court order, which he promptly secured. Afterwards, the accused, his lawyer and the creditor's representative went to the Bureau to secure the returns, but before the legal officer of the Bureau could comply with the request, the accused stated that he was only compelled to grant the authority and that he did not really want his income tax returns to be released. For this reason, the creditor failed to secure the income tax returns of accused as the Bureau refused to release, much less to divulge, the same in view of Sections 347 and 349 of the Internal Revenue Code. Ruling that the acts of accused were contumacious, the lower court, on motion of the creditor, found the accused guilty of contempt under par. d, Sec. 3, Rule 71, Rules of Court. Hence, this appeal. HELD: The refusal or change of heart of the accused to submit his income tax returns to the court for examination by his creditor after he had promised to do so cannot be considered as contempt. (1) The income tax returns sought was in no way connected *in the interest of the government*, and (2) the manner in which the income tax returns was sought to be produced in court was certainly not *in the manner provided by law*. (Cu Unjieng vs. Posadas, 58 Phil. 360; Arnaldo vs. Locsin, 69 Phil. 113).
2. ID.; ID.; LITIGANT MAY NOT BE COMPELLED TO PRODUCE HIS RETURNS.—Under the very elemental principle that a man cannot be forced to submit evidence to incriminate himself, a litigant cannot be compelled by the court to produce his income tax returns to be used by his opponent against him (Arnaldo vs. Locsin, 69 Phil. 113).

APPEAL from the order of the Court of First Instance of Davao. Vicente N. Cusi, Jr., J.

The facts are stated in the opinion of the Court.

Unson & Delante for accused and appellant.

Solicitor General Estelito P. Mendoza, Assistant Solicitor General Alicia V. Sempio-Diy and Solicitor Felix M. De Guzman for plaintiff and appellee.

SAN DIEGO, J.:

This is an appeal from the order dated August 31, 1970 of the Court of First Instance of Davao, finding the accused-appellant guilty of contempt of court, as follows:

"Wherefore, the Court finds Chu Tiong *alias* Te Liong guilty of improper conduct which impeded and/or obstructed and degraded the administration of justice under paragraph d, Section 3, Rule 71 of the Rules of Court, and hereby sentences him to six (6) months imprisonment and to pay the fine of P1,000.00 with subsidiary imprisonment in case of insolvency."

It appears that as judgment-debtor in Civil Case 4613, entitled "Sarmiento Enterprises, Inc., Plaintiff *vs.* Chu Tiong *alias* Te Liong", the accused-appellant, Chu Tiong *alias* Te Liong, was ordered to pay a certain sum of money to the plaintiff therein, Sarmiento Enterprises. The defendant, however, failed to pay the same, alleging that he had no money with which to satisfy the judgment. Convinced that Chu Tiong was solvent, the lawyers of the judgment-creditor required him to produce his income tax returns for the years from 1964 to 1968, for examination (Exh. L).

On September 9, 1969, while the said accused-appellant was being examined relative to his assets and liabilities, he promised to bring to court the copies of his tax returns to show that he really had no sufficient income (Exh. "A"). During the hearing held on September 10 and 27, 1969, however, the said accused failed to bring the income tax returns on the ground that his bookkeeper had misplaced them. Due to this fact, the counsel of the judgment-creditor asked the accused-appellant, whether he was willing to authorize the Court Commissioner or the plaintiff to secure the said returns from the Office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In spite of his counsel's vigorous objection, appellant prepared the authorization in the presence of the Court Commissioner. As it happened, the counsel of the judgment-creditor afterwards requested the Court Commissioner to set a time-limit for the appellant to produce his income tax returns, whereupon the said Commissioner gave the appellant "one week from today to produce those copies of his income tax returns for the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968, together with the certificate of the doctor as to the probable date of delivery of his wife on September" (Exhibit D and D-1).

On the basis of the foregoing authorization, the plaintiff sought to obtain appellant's income tax returns from the Bureau of Internal Revenue but failed to do so as said office required a written court order, which was promptly secured by plaintiff on October 18, 1969 (Original Record, p. 23).

On October 30, 1969, the appellant together with his lawyer, accompanied the plaintiff's representatives to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purpose of obtaining appellant's income tax returns; but before the legal officer of the Bureau of Internal Revenue could comply with the

request, the appellant stated that he was only compelled to grant the authority and that he did not really want his income tax to be released since the same would only be used against him (P. 31, Record and Exh. L). For this reason, the plaintiff failed to secure any of the appellant's income tax returns as the Bureau of Internal Revenue refused to release, much less to divulge the same in view of the provisions of Sections 347 and 349 of the Internal Revenue Code (Exh. L). Believing the acts of Chu Tiong to be contumacious, the lower court on the motion of plaintiff Sarmiento Enterprises, Inc., found the said Chu Tiong guilty of contempt.

Not satisfied with said judgment, the herein defendant interposed the present appeal, assigning the following errors:

I

"The lower court erred in finding the appellant guilty of improper conduct which impeded and/or obstructed and degraded the administration of justice, the evidence and circumstances of the case being insufficient to justify conviction.

II

"The court erred in imposing the maximum penalty of six (6) months imprisonment and a fine of one thousand (P1,000.00) pesos."

Given the circumstances of the case as recited above, we are of the considered opinion that there is no contempt committed. Be it remembered that income tax returns produceable in court only in conformity with regulations (No. 33, Relating to Inspection of Income Tax Returns, *Cu Unjieng vs. Posadas* 58 Phil. 360). In the *Cu Unjieng* case Section 11 of the Regulations (No. 33) relating to inspection of income tax returns, promulgated by the Secretary of Finance and approved by the Governor-General on October 13, 1962 was quoted as follows:

"Sec. 11. Copies of returns furnished for use in legal proceedings.—When it becomes necessary for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to furnish returns or copies thereof for use in legal proceedings, inspection of such returns or copies that necessarily results from such is permitted.

"The original income tax return of an individual, corporation, joint-stock company, partnership, joint account (*cuenta en participacion*), association, insurance company, or fiduciary, or a copy thereof, may be furnished by the Collector of Internal Revenue for use as evidence in litigation in any court, where the Government of the Philippine Islands is interested in the result, or for use in the preparation for such litigation, to provincial or city fiscal or any attorney connected with the Bureau of Justice designated to handle such matters, upon written request of the Attorney-General, or as assistant attorney acting on his behalf. When an income tax return or copy thereof is thus furnished, it must be limited in use to the purpose for which it is furnished, and is under no conditions to be made public except where publicity

necessarily results from such use.... Neither the original nor a copy of an income tax return, desired for use in litigation in court where the Government of the Philippine Islands is not interested in the result and where such use might result in making public the information contained therein, will be furnished, except as otherwise provided in the next succeeding section."

In the same case it was said:

"Again, it is evident that the provisions of law quoted above place no restriction upon the divulgence of the information contained in income tax returns when the publication of such information is made in the manner provide by law." * * *

The provisions of the National Internal Revenue Code regarding production of income tax returns in court require:

SEC. 81.01. Disposition of income tax returns.—All income tax returns filed with the Commissioner to Internal Revenue constitute public records which shall be open to inspection under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Finance with the approval of the President of the Philippines. The circumstances under which income tax returns may be inspected by interested parties are dealt with under separate regulations. (Sec. 247, Rev. Reg. No. 2)

SEC. 81.02. Income tax returns may be presented as evidence in court.—It is evident that the law places no restriction upon the divulgence of the information contained in income tax returns *when the publication of such information is made in the manner provided by law*. It results that when the custodian of income tax returns is lawfully required to reveal them, he is protected from the penalties expressed in Sections 2716 and 2731 of the Administrative Code. (Now Secs. 347 & 349, NIRC). There was no intention to restrict the use of these documents, *when their custodian is lawfully required to produce them or make their contents known*.

* * * * *

SEC. 81.03. Can a litigant be compelled to produce the original of his income tax returns.—A litigant may not be compelled through subpoena duces tecum, to produce the original of the income tax returns filed by him and recorded in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, nor an authenticated copy thereof which is not in his possession. (Arnaldo vs. Loesin 69 Phil. 113)

It will be noted that in the case for US, it is clear that:

1) the income tax returns sought was in no way connected *in the interest of the government*:

2) the manner in which the income tax returns was sought to be produced in court was certainly not *in the manner provided by law*. Even if for these two reasons alone the refusal of the appellant herein to commit his income tax returns to the court for examination by his creditor cannot be considered contempt.

It might be argued that appellant had indicated in open court his willingness to present the income tax returns. Be that as it may, the change of heart of the appellant later, leading to his refusal to *request* from the legal custodian thereof for a copy of his income tax returns, after

he had been advised by the legal officer of the Bureau that "he cannot be forced to produce his income tax returns" (p. 6, Appellant's Brief) is not a punishable act constituting contempt.

3) under the very elemental principle that a man cannot be forced to submit evidence to incriminate himself, appellant could not be compelled by the court to produce his income tax returns which was to be used by his opponent against him.

1. CERTIORARI; SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM.—A litigant may not be compelled, through *subpoena duces tecum*, to produce the original of the income tax returns filed by him recorded in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, nor an authenticated copy thereof which is not in his possession. (*Arnaldo vs. Locsin, et al.*, Phil. Rep., vol. 69 p. 113)

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the order appealed from is hereby reversed, and the accused is acquitted of the crime of contempt of court with costs *de officio*.

SO ORDERED.

Reyes L. B. and Busran, JJ., concur.

GANCAYCO, *J.*, dissenting:

The records of this case clearly show that the appellant led the trial court to believe that he was willing to produce his income tax returns any time. He made it appear that he exerted efforts to have the same located but to no avail and thereafter he manifested his willingness to produce his income tax returns and to secure it personally from the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He signed the written authority for its production even over the objection of his counsel. When the appellant thereafter reneged on his misrepresentations to the court and even imputed that he was forced to sign the authority, he obviously committed such improper conduct that impeded and degraded the administration of justice. He trifled with the faith of the court who was led into issuing the order for the production of his income tax returns by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The question of whether the production of such income tax returns can be lawfully ordered for purposes of the examination of the asset of a judgment debtor even if resolved in the negative, will not relieve the appellant of his responsibility for the deception he foisted on the court *a quo* and his subsequent act tending to impute that he signed the authorization under duress before the court, which is not true and most insulting.

Thus, I vote for the affirmance of his conviction, with costs against the appellant.

RAMOS, J., dissenting:

In his brief, appellant Chu Tiong pointed out that he was forced to sign the letter of authorization, empowering the Court Commissioner or the plaintiff to obtain his income tax returns from the Bureau of Internal Revenue. To buttress his stand, he stated that he only consented to sign the letter after having been browbeaten and subjected to a barrage of questions. Thus, when he told the Bureau of Internal Revenue legal officer that he granted the letter of authorization under duress, "he was not lying for such was his honest belief" (page 9).

Set against what actually happened, appellant's allegation cannot be given credence. For as found by the lower court (pp. 27-30, Original Record), when the appellant was asked if he was willing "to sign a request addressed to the Bureau of Internal Revenue" authorizing the surrender of the copies of his income tax returns for the years 1964 to 1968, he replied: "There is no need to sign because I will go there personally." Asked again if he wanted to sign the written request, he finally answered: "I am willing." (Appellant's brief, p. 4 and p. 32, Tsn, September 27, 1969). And so, then and there, he signed the letter of authorization, empowering the plaintiff or the Court Commissioner to obtain the income tax returns. At it turned out, however, at the time when the plaintiff's representatives could have secured a copy thereof, Chu Tiong, who was also in the Office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, objected on the ground already stated.

Thus seen, although at first Chu Tiong refused to sign the said letter of authorization, he ultimately agreed to do so. What then made him change his mind? When he objected to the release of his income tax returns by claiming that he was forced to sign the letter of authorization, it could only be due to the fact that he wanted to suppress an evidence that would establish his capacity to satisfy the judgment rendered against him. It is therefore plain that in spite of the order in connection with the production of said returns, appellant did not really have the intention to comply therewith, resulting in delay in the administration of justice and the consequent inability of the court to enforce its inherent right of self-preservation and power to compel obedience to its commands (*Commissioner of Immigration vs. Cloribel*, L-24139, December 31, 1967, 20 SCRA 1241). For acting thus, the defendant also misled the court by pretending that he was willing to produce the said returns although he was really set against it. Such discourteous act is an affront against the dignity of the court constituting contempt under Section 3, Rule 71 of the Rules of Court.

SO ORDERED.

Order reversed.

[No. 40231-R. July 22, 1974]*

PANGASINAN TRANSPORTATION Co., INC., (PANTRANCO),
plaintiff, appellee and appellant, *vs.* FILEMON CAJATOR,
ET AL., defendants, appellees and appellants.

1. DAMAGES; WRONGFUL LEVY ON EXECUTION; SEC. 12, RULE 39, RULES OF COURT, NOT EXCLUSIVE; A RUNNING BUS WITH PASSENGERS IS EXEMPT FROM EXECUTION.—The enumeration in Section 12, Rule 39, of the Rules of Court, on the properties exempt from execution, is not exclusive. A bus filled with passengers travelling on its usual route is also exempt from execution because of its obligation to transport its passengers to their respective destinations.
2. ID.; ID.; ID.; ID.; LIABILITY OF SHERIFF.—The sheriff who, acting upon the suggestion of another person, stops, intercepts and seizes a running bus filled with passengers, is liable with the latter for damages for wrongful execution.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Court of First Instance
of Pangasinan. Jose S. De La Cruz, *J.*

The facts are stated in the opinion of the Court.

Filemon Cajator for defendants, appellees and appellants.

Jose S. Songco for plaintiff, appellee and appellant.

BAUTISTA, *J.*:

This is an action for damages filed by the Pangasinan Transportation Co., Inc. (PANTRANCO) against defendants Filemon Cajator and Jose Soriano which arose from the alleged illegal seizure of the Pantranco passenger bus by defendant Jose Soriano, as Deputy Sheriff of Pampanga, who executed the complained illegal seizure at the instance of his co-defendant Atty. Filemon Cajator, in compliance with a partial writ of execution pending appeal issued in Civil Case No. 2405 of the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, entitled "Alcantara Tongol, et al., *vs.* Pangasinan Transportation Co. Inc. et al" in which defendant Filemon Cajator is the attorney for the plaintiffs Tongol et al. (p. 2, Defendants-Appellants' Brief).

It appears that complaint in Civil Case No. 2405 before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, Branch I for damages was filed on November 6, 1963 by Alcantara Tongol et al. *vs.* the Pangasinan Transportation Co. Inc. et al. and its driver Fermin Cera for damages arising out of an accident involving Pantranco Bus No. 350 on September 30, 1963 which resulted in the death of Ernesto Canlas, husband of plaintiff Alcantara Tongol and father of the three other plaintiffs minors Susana, Ligaya and Josephine, all surnamed Canlas.

After due trial, the Court of First Instance of Pampanga rendered judgment condemning the defendants Pantranco and Fermin Cera to pay the plaintiffs the following:

* Vol. 19 C.A.R. (2s), p.———

"1) For the death of Ernesto Canlas	P 6,000.00
2) For the horse	500.00
3) For the calesa	800.00
4) For the guarnicion	100.00
5) For funeral expenses	1,200.00
6) For moral damages	5,000.00
7) For attorney's fees	2,000.00 or a
total of	P15,600.00".

Upon motion of the Tongols for execution pending appeal, the Court of First Instance of Pampanga allowed the issuance only of the partial execution of the judgment insofar as the sum of P8,600.00 is concerned. The court abstain to issue a writ of execution relative to attorney's fees and moral damages "until the Appellate Court shall finally resolve on these items" (pp. 11, 13, 14, Record on Appeal). The writ of execution pending appeal reads:

"WRIT OF EXECUTION PENDING APPEAL

TO:—

The Provincial Sheriff of Pampanga or any of his duly authorized deputies San Fernando, Pampanga

WHEREAS, a judgment was rendered in this case condemning the defendants jointly and severally to pay the plaintiffs the following sums of money:

1) For the death of Ernesto Canlas	P6,000.00
2) For the horse	500.00
3) For the calesa	800.00
4) For the guarnicion	100.00
5) For funeral expenses	1,200.00
6) For moral damages	5,000.00
7) For attorney's fees	2,000.00

WHEREAS, the defendants are interposing an appeal from the said judgment;

WHEREAS, the Court of First Instance of Pampanga allowed the issuance in this case of a partial execution of the said judgment of this Court in so far as the amount of P8,600.00 only thereof is concerned, provided that the plaintiffs would post a bond of an equal amount of P8,600.00;

WHEREAS, the said plaintiffs have filed the said bond of P8,600.00 which was approved by this court.

Now THEREFORE, you are hereby commanded that of the goods and chattels of the said defendants Pangasinan Transportation Co. (PANTRANCO), and Fernin Cera y Gamit, you cause to be made the sum of P8,600.00 together with 6% annual interest thereon from March 19, 1966 which is the date of the judgment of this Court until fully paid, together with your lawful fees for the service of this execution, all in Philippine currency which the plaintiffs recovered in this case against the said defendants, and that you render the same to the said plaintiffs or to their counsel of record, Atty. Filemon Cajator, aside from your own fees on this execution, and do you likewise return this writ into Court within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, with your proceedings endorsed thereon. But, if sufficient personal properties cannot be found whereof to satisfy this execution and your lawful fees thereon, then you are commanded that of the lands and buildings of the said defendants you make the said sums of money in the manner required by the Rules

of Court, and make return of your proceedings hereon within sixty (60) days from the date of this writ.

Witness, the Honorable Malcolm G. Sarmiento, Judge of said Court, this 13th day of July, 1966.

(Sgd.) MARCELO D. MENDIOLA
Clerk of Court".

The writ of execution was received for service by the office of the Provincial Sheriff of Pampanga on July 19, 1966 (tsn, p. 68, May 9, 1967). On the same date, defendant-appellant, Filemon Cajator, as attorney of the plaintiffs in that case, handcarried the following letter to the Provincial Sheriff of Pampanga:

"19 July 1966

The Prov. Sheriff
San Fernando, Pampanga

Re: Civil Case No. 2405, Alcantara Tongol, et al. vs. PANTRANCO, et al.

Sir:

In implementing the writ of execution pending appeal dated July 18, 1966, issued in the above-entitled case which I already delivered to you yesterday, July 18, 1966, for and in representation of the plaintiffs, may I request of you to please immediately levy on execution at least one (1) new, air-conditioned passenger bus of defendant PANTRANCO bus passing thru San Fernando, Pampanga either going to Pangasinan or to Manila by stopping it, taking actual possession thereof, and placing it under your complete control and custody in your office, and thereafter advertize it for sale at public auction in the manner provided by law, to satisfy the said writ of execution.

But if you could not find a new air-conditioned passenger bus of the said defendants, please levy on execution by taking actual possession thereof two (2) ordinary passenger buses of the said defendants and thereafter advertize them for sale at public auction.

Very truly,

(Sgd.) FILEMON CAJATOR
Attorney of the Plaintiff
(Exh. 5)".

On July 22, 1966 or three days after Cajator made his foregoing request, defendant PANTRANCO, et al. filed a motion for reconsideration to suspend the order issuing the writ of execution pending appeal on the ground that they have not been given the opportunity to oppose said order. On the same date, the court suspended the implementation of the writ. But on July 30, 1966, a Saturday, the Court denied defendant's motion for reconsideration and therefore restored the efficacy of the writ of execution which was suspended (p. 12, Plaintiff-Appellant's Brief).

On August 2, 1966, defendant-appellant Deputy Sheriff Jose Soriano, acting on his co-defendant's request, intercepted, stopped and seized PANTRANCO Bus No. 1007. On

the circumstances surrounding the seizure, the evidence for opposing parties differ but only slightly. Rogelio Balbas, the driver, makes the following narration:

While driving Bus No. 1007 *along the route going to Dagupan City*, a certain person with a pistol tucked in his waist (p. 10, tsn, Hearing of Nov. 16, 1966), stopped the car in front of Camp Olivas, San Fernando, Pampanga (p. 9, tsn, Ibid). What happened afterwards is that:

"A. When the door opened this man approached and said: 'Driver, stop the engine and go down'. (p. 10, t.s.n., Ibid) He also ordered the passengers to go down saying, 'I am taking this bus because the Pantranco has not made any payment of its indebtedness. A big company like this cannot pay its debt'. At this juncture, the already frightened passengers pleaded with the man saying, 'Please let us go. We are going to far places, like Alaminos, Baguio and other places in Pangasinan'. The man, however, remained adamant. Whereupon, the driver and the passengers reluctantly alighted from the car. It was around 1:30 in the afternoon and the sun was unbearably hot. And the passengers were impatient and angry. Some of them kept murmuring: 'What is the matter? We are paying our fares and we are inconvenienced. A very big company cannot pay its debts?'" (pp. 20-21, tsn, Ibid).

As the passengers vented their ire, Rogelio Balbas stealthily ambled towards the P.C. headquarters which was just a stone throw from where the bus was stopped. Upon reaching the place, he narrated his predicament and was successful in convincing a sergeant and a captain to intercede in his behalf and in behalf of the hapless passengers who, by now, were being greatly inconvenienced by the scorching heat of the sun.

The P.C. officers could not, however, offer much help as the man dismissed their plea with these words: "This is a civil case, Captain. This is not military case. Do Not intervene". (p. 16, tsn, Ibid) Forthwith, the deputy sheriff successfully seized the bus at around 3:30 P.M. and brought the same to the Provincial Capitol at San Fernando, Pampanga. When the bus was gone, Balbas helped the passengers to transfer to other buses until at around 4 o'clock P.M., everyone of them was able to get a ride.

On further examination, Rogelio Balbas testified that he came to know that the man was the Deputy Provincial Sheriff of Pampanga only when the latter was called by the PC Captain to the headquarters. It was in the headquarters, too, that he (the driver) saw Filemon Cajator talking to the PC captain for almost two hours, apparently blocking the latter from interfering with the coercive measure taken by the defendant sheriff.

For background purposes, plaintiff-appellant introduced the testimony of two witnesses, Rustico Elinzano and Santiago Jeronilla. Rustico P. Elinzano, office Manager of the Pantranco in Dagupan City, testified that Bus No. 1007 of the Pantranco was out in operation on June 23, 1965 and costs P50,080.35; that he learned of the attachment of the bus when the Branch Manager of the Pantranco in Tarlac called up at about three or four o'clock in the afternoon; that after the seizure of the bus, Atty. Artemio Corpuz and Mr. Vicente Sales came to the Pantranco office in Dagupan City blaming the Pantranco for the inconvenience that they had suffered; and for their failure to meet their respective appointments.

According to the same witness, the news spread far and wide and it reached even a columns of the "Sunday Punch", a weekly newspaper in Dagupan City, who wanted to write something about it. However, after treating the newspaperman to a coffee break, the witness was able to convince the former to desist from doing the same.

He added that Bus No. 1007 makes one round trip from Dagupan to Manila in one day and earns from P150.00 to P200.00 per trip; that it left Manila at 12:00 noon on August 2, 1966 and was supposed to make a return trip from Dagupan to Manila at 7:30 in the evening; that because of its detention in San Fernando, the bus failed to make one round trip on August 2, 1966 and another round trip on August 3, 1966; and that the actual book value of the bus, as of December 31, 1966 is P39,655.00.

Santiago Jeronilla, the Deputy Sheriff of Manila was presented by the plaintiff-appellant to inform the lower court about the procedure followed in their office in the execution of money judgment. He testified that:

"The procedure in our office is that we make a demand on the judgment debtor. As soon as we have made a formal demand on the judgment debtor we serve the writ of execution and require the debtor to pay his obligation and if he is not able to pay upon demand, upon instructions of the defendant's counsel we levy on the other properties of the defendant." (pp. 26-27, tsn., hearing of March 15, 1967)

The reason behind the procedure according to Jeronilla is to satisfy immediately the writ of execution by actual payment without undergoing the tedious process of levying the properties of the judgment debtor (pp. 28-30, tsn, Ibid). On cross-examination, he, however, testified that the practice of first making a demand before actual levy is not provided by law (pp. 34-35, tsn, Ibid).

The evidence of the defendants-appellants on the other hand, tend to establish the following facts: that between two and three o'clock in the afternoon of August 2, 1966, the defendant-appellant Jose Soriano levied Bus No. 1007

in front of Camp Olivas, San Fernando, Pampanga; that he levied the said bus by virtue of the writ of execution dated July 13, 1966; that he did so by first identifying himself as Deputy Provincial Sheriff of Pampanga and reading at the same time the said writ of execution to the driver and the passengers; that he followed this up with a request that they should all go down from the bus; that then and there the driver said: "No, I cannot get down this bus because I am going to consult first a PC officer;" that the said driver alighted from the car, went to the PC headquarters and persuaded a certain Captain Tiboyen and Sergeant Manaois to ask for deferment of the implementation of the writ of execution; that the Sheriff, however, refused to comply with the request of the PC officers because he might be dismissed from his duty if he would release the bus; that he added though that he could only release the car upon orders of the court or upon payment of the judgment debt; that there was later an agreement between the Clerk of Court of First Instance of Pampanga and the PC Captain that the lawyer of the PANTRANCO should immediately settle the obligation so that the bus could be released but because the same was not complied with, defendant-appellant Jose Soriano, brought the bus to the Capitol grounds in San Fernando, Pampanga on August 2, 1966 at around 5 o'clock in the afternoon; and that on his way there, he saw his co-defendant Filemon Cajator passing in front of Camp Olivas.

After due trial, the lower court in a decision dated July 19, 1967 ordered both defendants Filemon Cajator and Jose Soriano to pay jointly and severally the plaintiff Pantranco the sum of P600.00 plus the costs (p. 104, Record on Appeal). From this decision, both plaintiff and defendants have appealed to this court.

Defendants-Appellants claim that:

"I

The lower court committed a mistake in holding that Pantranco Bus No. 1007 could not be levied upon on execution because at the time of the levy it was filled with passengers.

II

The lower court committed a mistake in holding that before defendant Deputy Prov. Sheriff Jose Soriano made the levy on Pantranco Bus No. 1007 in that civil case No. 2405, Court of First Instance of Pampanga, Alcantara Tongol, et al. *vs.* Pangasinan Transit Co., et al., he should have first made a demand for payment to judgment defendant therein in order to avoid the levy.

III

The lower court committed a mistake in basing its decision appealed from upon the rulings of the Supreme Court in the case of *People vs. Hernandez* (59 Phil., 343) whose facts are entirely distinct and different from those obtaining in this case.

IV

The lower court committed a mistake in holding that defendant Deputy Prov. Sheriff Jose Soriano is personally liable for having levied on execution Pantrance Bus No. 1007 in strict compliance with the writ of execution (Exh. 2) directed to 'the provincial Sheriff of Pampanga or any of his duly authorized deputies, San Fernando, Pampanga', and as indicated by the undersigned counsel to the prov. sheriff himself in his letter dated July 19, 1966 (Exh. 5).

V

The lower court committed a mistake in condemning Atty. Filemon Cajator and his co-defendant to pay jointly and severally P600.00 plus costs to plaintiff.

VI

The lower court committed a mistake in not condemning the plaintiff to pay defendants the sum of P3,000.00 for and as attorney's fees, and P608.00 as litigation expenses for filing in bad faith against them this clearly groundless complaint.

VII

The lower court committed a mistake in deciding this case adversely against the defendants."

Plaintiff-appellant on the other hand, argues that:

"I

The lower court erred in not finding that defendants-appellants, especially Filemon Cajator, 'an experienced and prominent law practitioner' (p. 20, decision) acted with bad faith and malice with the intention of causing embarrassment to plaintiff-appellant, an admittedly solvent corporation, when he caused and instigated as well as actively participated in the attachment of the latter's bus worth P50,080.35 without notice in order to enforce a judgment of only P8,600.00 which could have been satisfied in cash had the writ of execution been presented to any of its offices in Tarlac, Tarlac, Quezon City or Dagupan City.

II

The lower court while finding defendants-appellants at fault, erred in not awarding temperate damages to plaintiff-appellant for the injury to its reputation and business standing and credit, occasioned by the embarrassing, malicious abusive and tortious attachment, without any previous notice whatsoever, of its passenger bus worth P50,080.35 in Pampanga while the same was on its way from Quezon city to Dagupan city filled with passengers who were thus stranded, in order to enforce a money judgment of only P8,600.00.

III

The lower court, while admitting that the attachment of plaintiff-appellant's bus was abusive and wrongful, erred in not awarding exemplary damages and attorney's fees on the erroneous assumption that 'the abusive or wrongful enforcement of the writ of execution was undoubtedly due more to the defendant's erroneous comprehension of the law than to bad faith or malice.' (p. 23, decision, italics supplied).

The dominant question presently to be resolved is whether or not it was abusive and wrongful for the Deputy Sheriff of Pampanga to intercept, stop and seize Pantranco

Bus No. 1007, as suggested by his co-defendant-appellant Filemon Cajator in his letter dated July 19, 1966.

Defendants-appellants held the view in the negative because "there is no law which exempts from execution a passenger bus simply because it is filled with passengers" (p. 10, Defendants-Appellants' Brief). In support of their stand, they cited Section 12, Rule 39 of the New Rules of Court which does not mention common carriers as one of those exempt from execution. Secondly, they argue that the defendant sheriff, in seizing Pantranco Bus No. 1007 merely exercised his duty in compliance with a lawful court order.

While it may be conceded that under Section 12, Rule 39 of the New Rules of Court, a common carrier filled with passengers and on its usual route is not among those exempted from execution, nevertheless, the fact that it has the obligation to transport the passengers to their respective destination moves it from the attendant circumstances here prevailing beyond the coverage of execution and/or attachment. As the lower court aptly puts it:

"When the bus left its point of departure, x x x filled with passengers, the latter, upon paying their fares x x x had acquired a right or interest to be transported by the Pantranco to their respective destination on a continuous trip. Said bus could not be attached or levied upon by defendant Sheriff without nullifying said right or interest without impairing the obligation of Pantranco towards its passengers".

Defendants-appellants, however, maintain that this stand of the lower court is erroneous on the ground that the enumeration in Section 12, Rule 39 is exclusive.

To our mind, this contention of defendants-appellants cannot be supported by reason or law. Under the New Civil Code there are properties other than those mentioned in Section 12, Rule 39, which are exempt from execution. To cite a few, we have the following provisions:

"ART. 302. Neither the right to receive legal support nor any money or property obtained as such support or any pension or gratuity from the government is subject to attachment or execution."

"ART. 1708. The laborer's wages shall not be subject to execution or attachment except for debts incurred for food, shelter, clothing and medical attendance."

"ART. 2026. He who constitutes an annuity by gratuitous title upon his property, may provide at the time the annuity is established that the same shall not be subject to execution or attachment on account of the obligations of the recipient of the annuity. If the annuity was constituted in fraud of creditors, the latter may ask for the execution or attachment of the property."

In addition to the foregoing properties expressly exempted from execution by the Civil Code, the following are likewise exempted:

1. Property mortgaged to the DBP (CA 458, Sec. 26);
2. Savings of National Prisoners Deposited with the Postal Savings Bank (Act 2489);
3. Backpay of Pre-War Civilian Employees (RA 394);
4. Philippine Government Backpay to Guerillas (RA 879);
5. Produce, work animals and farm implements of agricultural lessees, subject to limitations (RA 6398); and
6. Benefits from private retirement systems of companies and establishments, with limitations (RA 4917).

It is therefore clear that the enumeration in Section 12, Rule 39 is not exclusive as maintained by defendants-appellants. Hence, they cannot cite said Rule as their basis for levying Pantranco Bus No. 1007.

While it may again be conceded that defendant-appellant was confronted with a question of law difficult to decide on the spot, it would not have cost him to defer the implementation of the writ or to consult his superiors so that they may have conceived of a way to properly execute the judgment. After all, the sheriff is not required to immediately enforce the writ as erroneously maintained by the defendants-appellants because the court order itself provides that he is enjoined to return the writ within thirty (30) days from receipt of the same, or if no sufficient personal properties cannot be found, he should make the return within sixty (60) days from the date of the said writ (see pp. 10-12, Rec. on Appeal of Defendants-Appellants). Besides, the evidence on record shows that plaintiff-appellant corporation "is a solvent corporation" and "can very well satisfy the writ of execution", to borrow the words of the Pampanga court (p. 57, Plaintiff's Rec. on Appeal) that issued the writ of execution.

The sheriff then should have made a demand for payment on the Pantranco at any of its offices in Tarlac, Tarlac, in Quezon City or in Dagupan City, as correctly observed by the lower court. And in case of Pantranco's refusal or failure to pay, he should have, with authority of the court, levied upon any of its personal property in any of its said offices (Decision, p. 99, Defendant's Rec. on Appeal). A norm of conduct under the circumstances has been laid down by the Supreme Court:

"When an obligation may be complied with or a right enforced in one way or the other, without detriment to the person charged with such compliance or enforcement, there is no need of doing so to the annoyance and humiliation of the persons concerned. As much as possible, one should find some means of harmonizing compliance with such duty and enforcement of such right with the rights and obligations of others" (*People vs. Hernandez*, 39 Phil. 343)

Defendants-Appellants, however, maintain that "the lower court seems to place limitations, restrictions and restraints on the mandatory duty of a sheriff to seize personal property of a judgment debtor with a valid writ

of execution, when the law does not prescribe such limitations, restrictions and restraints.”

To our mind, the lower court did not place any limitations, restrictions and restraints on the mandatory duty of a sheriff to enforce a valid writ of execution. It, however, meant to restrain the sheriff in the uninhibited manner he would perform his mandatory duty. When the lower court said:

“The defendant sheriff must, in the exercise of his rights and in the performance of his duties act with justice, give everyone his due and observe honesty and good faith (Art. 19, New Civil Code). The ministerial duty of the sheriff should have its limitations and he knows or must have known what is inherently right and inherently wrong. (*Machinery and Engineering Supplies vs. Pecson*, CA-G.R. No. 11248-R, July 24, 1953).”

it meant with good reason, to restrain the deputy sheriff from wanton and uninhibited enforcement of the writ of execution. Restraining the performance of the mandatory duty itself and restraining *the manner such duty is to be performed* are two different things. To restrain a sheriff from performing his duty is to prevent him from performing his duty. But restraining a sheriff from a cavalier exercise of his powers is to make him perform his duties in an orderly manner so as to avoid folly and needless injury, suffering and embarrassment.

But defendants-appellants insist that “a sheriff has no discretion whether to execute a writ or not.” To support this allegation, they quoted several authorities stating that a sheriff has no authority to delay a levy and that if he delays in making an immediate levy, he can be held liable.

While it is true that the duty of a sheriff is purely ministerial, yet such duty “should have its limitations. The sheriff knew or must have known what is inherently right and inherently wrong” (*Machinery & Engineering Supplies, Inc. vs. Judge Potenciano Pecson, et al.*, CA-G.R. No. 11248-R, July 24, 1953).

It seems however that the sheriff’s better judgment could not work well under the circumstances. It will be recalled that his co-defendant, Filemon Cajator requested the sheriff’s office to “Please levy on execution at least one (1) new air-conditioned passenger bus of defendant Pantranco passing San Fernando, Pampanga” or “two passenger buses of the said defendant”; that defendant Cajator was personally present in Camp Olivas and “admitted having blocked the PC captain from interfering with the coercive measures taken by the defendant sheriff” (Decision, p. 100, Rec. on Appeal of Defendants-Appellants). Just the same, because he lent himself as an instrument to harass and embarrass plaintiff-appellant corporation, “the result

must be that he should x x x answer, as a joint tortfeasor (Uy *vs.* Bormaheco, et al., CA-G.R. No. 29798-R, Nov. 4, 1963).

Defendant-appellant Cajator should likewise be held liable on the ground that "he did not only allow the defendant sheriff alone to exercise his own judgment as to the enforcement of execution but also wrote the latter (Exh. 5) requesting said officer to levy upon the new air-conditioned bus or two ordinary passenger buses of the Pantranco" (Decision, pp. 99-100, Rec. on Appeal).

Defendant-appellant Cajator this time maintains that he cannot be held liable for the tortious acts of the defendant sheriff when the latter is not his subordinate; that he was merely acting as an agent of his disclosed principals who are his clients. Apparently, Atty. Cajator now wants to toss the entire blame on his co-defendant. Yet, he cannot deny that the seizure by the sheriff of plaintiff's bus was upon his express indication in his letter dated July 19, 1966. And as already mentioned elsewhere in the preceding discussion, his ubiquitous self was seen at the time when the bus was seized, actively participating and intervening in the whole proceeding.

The trial court was correct in concluding from facts proved that the wrongful implementation of the writ of execution was due more precisely to defendants' erroneous compliance of the law than to bad faith and malice; and that with respect to defendant Filemon Cajator that the latter was over-zealous and hasty in promoting the interest of his clients. It is significant to observe that at the very start, Atty. Cajator wrote the Office of the Provincial Sheriff officially to immediately levy at least one new air-conditioned passenger bus or two ordinary passenger buses. There was nothing concealed in the entire transaction. Indeed, if Atty. Cajator was motivated by malice and bad faith, he should not have so openly made the request in writing particularly referring to the Pantranco buses plying from Quezon City to Dagupan City to be the subject-matter of the execution. And he was evidently influenced in his opinion, albeit erroneously, by the fact that admittedly Pantranco had no other properties in the province of Pampanga aside from the buses passing there (p. 62, t.s.n., May 9, 1967).

With respect to defendant Jose Soriano, the evidence is not controverted, that when Capt. Tiboyon was conducting his investigation Deputy Sheriff Soriano called up the Provincial Sheriff Atty. Mendiola and requested for instructions. Then, Atty. Mendiola directed Soriano to take the buses to the Provincial Sheriff which was done. Of course, when he followed the unlawful order, he is not

exempt from his liability as a tortfeasor. The call made by Deputy Sheriff Soriano on the Provincial Sheriff did not mitigate his liability for damages. He had to make the call at the behest of Capt. Tiboyon after damage was already done. The passengers on Pantranco Bus 1007 were already ordered to alight and the bus was already sequestered ready to be brought to the Provincial Capitol. And all the deputy sheriff did was, as admitted by him, to ask his "x x x chief, the Clerk of Court, if it would be legal to bring the bus in our office, and he said, "yes, you bring the bus to our office" (p. 55, t.s.n., hearing May 9, 1967).

In fine we are aware of the conflicting views on the question whether or not properties of public utility corporations or quasi-public corporations are liable to execution. One view is that to seize the properties of a public utility corporation on execution would practically disable such corporation from performing its public service or public duty to the great detriment of the public interest. The other view is that to exclude properties of quasi-public corporation from execution would paralyze the power of the law to enforce payment of just debts. It seems to be the weight of authority that if quasi-public corporation does not have sufficient property to cover its indebtedness covered by lawful writs of execution, such corporation is deemed to have abandoned its public purpose for which such corporation is created. Hence, it is only logical that its properties are subject to execution.

"A conflict of opinion exists as to the liability to execution of the property of corporations created to carry on a business valuable to the public, such as a railroad, bridge, canal, or similar corporation. On the one side, it has been said that such a corporation would be disabled from performing its public duties if its property, essential in so doing, could be seized and sold, and thus the public would suffer great harm. On the other side, it has been argued that to exclude such property would cripple the power of the law to enforce the payment of debts and exempt from its scope a great mass of property. In any event, the unavailability of property of a quasi-public corporation for execution is co-extensive only with the performance of the public purposes the corporation is intended to promote, and where these purposes are abandoned, the reason for the exclusion ceases and the property is subject to execution the same as other property. This rule is applicable to property of a railroad corporation which has ceased to discharge its duties and has not, for a long time, used its franchise and right of way for any purpose". (Sec. 203, 30 Am. Jur. 2d, p. 562)

In the case at bar, the question of the solvency or insolvency of Pantranco was not directly put in issue although the lower court in its Order dated August 3, 1966 recognized the capacity of Pantranco to satisfy the indebtedness covered by the questioned writ of execution. All considered, a higher degree of caution and circumspec-

tion was demanded of defendants before they had ventured levying on a public service vehicle just to satisfy the amount of only ₱8,600.00. The haste and overbearing manner the writ was implemented as discussed above fully justify the imposition of the damages by the trial court.

WHEREFORE, the decision appealed from is hereby affirmed.

SO ORDERED.

*Lucero, Actg. Pres. J. and Melencio Herrera, J., concur.
Judgment affirmed.*

**MGA KAUTUSANG PANGPANGASIWAAN AT ALITUNTUNIN NG
MGA KAGAWARAN, KAWANIHAN AT TANGGAPAN**
(DEPARTMENT, BUREAU AND OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE
ORDERS AND REGULATIONS)

Tanggapan ng Pangulo ng Pilipinas
(OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT)

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
PROFESSIONAL REGULATION COMMISSION
MANILA

BOARD OF CHEMISTRY

RESOLUTION No. 10
Series of 1975

RULES AND REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING
PRESIDENTIAL DECREE NO. 683, WHICH
ALLOWS HOLDERS OF DOCTOR OF PHI-
LOSOPHY DEGREES IN CHEMISTRY TO
REGISTER AS CHEMIST WITHOUT EXAM-
INATION.

Pursuant to the provision of Section 16 of Republic Act No. 754, the Board of Chemistry hereby promulgates the following rules to implement and carry out the purpose of Presidential Decree No. 683, amending Section 18 of Republic Act No. 754, otherwise known as the Chemistry Law.

Section 1. *Who may apply for registration.*—All applicants who are holders of Doctor of Philosophy degrees in Chemistry or its equivalent shall be entitled to register as Chemist without examination.

Sec. 2. *Filing of application.*—The application must be filed with the Application Section of the Professional Regulation Commission in a prescribed form duly accomplished and sworn to by the applicant for action by the Board.

The application should be submitted together with the following documents:

1. Transcript of records
2. Doctoral dissertation
3. Diploma

4. Copy of the requirements for such doctorate degree, if obtained abroad
5. Certificate of professional experience.

The Professional Regulation Commission, through the Board of Chemistry, after evaluation of the documents and exhibits submitted together with the application shall inform the applicant of the action taken.

SEC. 3. *Issuance of Certificate of Registration.*—Upon approval of the application by the Board and after payment of the required fee (without examination) of P150.00 and registration fee of P80.00 the Board subject to approval by the Professional Regulation Commission, shall issue a certificate which shall entitle the registrant to practice chemistry in the Philippines subject to payment of the annual registration fee provided for in Section 3 of Republic Act No. 6511.

SEC. 4. *Effectivity.*—These rules and regulations shall take effect upon approval by the Professional Regulation Commission.

Adopted in the City of Manila this 30th day of April, 1975.

(Sgd.) REMEDIOS ABELLA LIM
Chairman

(Sgd.) ELIAS C. CANAPI, JR.
Member

(Sgd.) ARSENIO M. REGALA
Member

Attest:

(Sgd.) INOCENTES Y. PABELLO
Secretary

Approved by the Professional Regulation Commission in its 1st indorsement dated April 30, 1975.

Kagawaran ng Katarungan

(DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE)

OPINION NO. 46, s. 1975

The Secretariat
The Permanent Inter-Agency Technical

Committee on Trade, Tariff & Related Matters
National Economic Development Authority
Manila

Sir:

This is in reply to your request for opinion on the question "whether there is a necessity to amend our Constitution if the Philippines is to grant national treatment to the investments of German nationals in the Philippines", as proposed by the German government in connection with the investment treaty pending ratification by the Philippine government.

Citizenship requirements affecting foreign investments are found either in the Constitution [e.g. Art. XIV, Sec. 5, re operation of public utilities; Art. XIV, Sec. 9, re exploitation of natural resources; Art XV, Sec. 7(1) re ownership and management of mass media] or in special laws [e.g. R.A. No. 1180, re the Retail Trade; R.A. No. 337 re banking institutions]. A grant of national treatment to German citizens in areas of investment nationalized by the Constitution would require constitutional amendment, as in the case of the Ordinance Appended to the Constitution otherwise known as the Parity Amendment. However, with respect to the citizenship requirement regarding natural resources and the operation of public utilities, attention is invited to Article XIV, Section 15 of the new Constitution, which provides:

"SEC. 15. Any provision of paragraph one, Section fourteen, Article eight and of this Article notwithstanding, the Prime Minister may enter into international treaties or agreements as the national welfare and interest may require."

Where the nationality requirement is imposed by ordinary legislation, an ordinary law, or the treaty itself granting national treatment, may grant business parity rights; in the latter case, the treaty would have the effect of superseding the prior nationalization law which is inconsistent with it.

Please be advised accordingly.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) VICENTE ABAD SANTOS
Secretary of Justice

OPINION NO. 47, s. 1975

1st Indorsement

March 17, 1975

Respectfully transmitted to the Secretary of Natural Resources, Diliman, Quezon City, inviting attention to the herein papers regarding Civil Case No. 2169, in the Court of First Instance of Surigao, Branch II, for "Replevin or Manual Delivery of Personal Property with Damages and Temporary Restraining Order", filed by Mr. Jesus Patiño against the members of the Committee for the Disposition of Confiscated Logs and other Forest Products illegally cut from the Surigao Mineral Reservation.

It appears that after the sale of the confiscated logs in question, at public auction, the plaintiff and the defendant Committee entered into a compromise agreement whereby after deducting the regular forest charges and penalties, and other taxes and fees due the Government, and the amounts due to the intervenor-lessor of logging equipment, the balance of the proceeds of the sale were given to the plaintiff. It is doubtful whether the said Committee had the power to enter into said compromise agreement under the circumstances, and neither is it correct to assume, as a basis for said settlement, that the passage of P.D. No. 295, authorizing logging inside the Surigao Mineral Reservation, cured the illegality in the unauthorized logging.

Your office is advised of this matter for whatever action you may wish to take in the premises.

(Sgd.) VICENTE ABAD SANTOS
Secretary of Justice

OPINION NO. 48, s. 1975

9th Indorsement

March 17, 1975

Respectfully returned to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Manila, the within request for comment on the following questions posed by the Philippine Ambassador at New Delhi in connection with the visa application of Indian national Gulshanpal Singh Brar (allegedly the son of Gurbachan Singh Brar who was admitted to the Philippines on an Indian non-preference quota immigrant status):

"1) Whether the Cabinet directive of 1951 to adopt a policy to the effect that only nationals of countries that admit Filipino citizens into their territories for permanent residence may be admitted into the Philippines

as immigrants, as referred to in Section 10 of Chapter XVI of the Revised Foreign Service Regulations, and FSC 271-63 (based on the Philippine-Indian Exchange of Notes dated October 16, 1962) listing the conditions for the lifting of the suspension of the entry as quota immigrants of Indian citizens, are still in effect and binding on consular officials in their visa functions;

"2) Whether the provisions of the above-cited policy and international agreement can be modified, revised or set aside by the Bureau of Immigration and Deportation;

"3) Whether the entry of an alien who entered the Philippines contrary to the provisions of the above policy and regulations can be legitimized solely by an administrative procedure of the Bureau of Immigration and Deportation, and finally;

"4. Whether an immigration status conferred on an alien under item 3 above could be used as a basis for the issuance of preference quota visa of the relatives of said alien joining him for permanent residence in the Philippines by a consular officer abroad."

At the outset, I wish to dwell on the implications readily discernible from the basic communication and the within 4th and 5th indorsements: that the policy adopted in the cited 1951 Cabinet directive had been "modified, revised or set aside" by the Bureau of Immigration in its actions in the Brar case and that Mr. Gurbachan Singh Brar was allowed to enter the Philippines "contrary to the provisions of the above policy and regulation", such illegal entry having been "legitimized solely by an administrative proceeding" of said Bureau. A consideration of the nature of the functions of that Department and of the Commission on Immigration and Deportation with respect to the enforcement of immigration laws should correct any such misimpression. It is clear from the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1940 (Commonwealth Act No. 163, as amended) that while responsibility for the administration in the Philippines of our immigration laws is vested in the Commissioner of Immigration and Deportation, the implementation of the same abroad is incumbent upon the representatives of the Department of Foreign Affairs thereat. Appropriately, sections 15, 16 and 17 of the said statute, providing for the documentation of immigrants, entrust to consular officers the function of issuing immigration visas and the responsibility of determining whether an alien applicant is admissible to the country under our immigration laws. (More particularly, Section 17 explicitly provides that "no immigration visa shall be issued to an immigrant if the consular officer knows from statements in the application therefor or from the papers submitted therewith or otherwise has reason

to believe that the immigrant is inadmissible into the Philippines under the immigration laws.") And it has even been held that discretion is involved in this duty such that even if the Immigration Commissioner conducts his own investigation and decides favorably in an application for immigration visa, a consular officer is not bound by such finding. (*Ng Gioc Liu vs. Sec. of Foreign Affairs*, 85 Phil. 842 [1951]) I therefore fail to see how in the present case the finding of the Commission on Immigration and Deportation, if there had been one, as to the admissibility of Mr. Gurbachan Singh Brar, could have prevailed over the determination of the consular official at New Delhi on the same matter.

Although the foregoing observations should render unnecessary further discussion on the queries, I wish to make the following comments to set at rest all residual doubt on the matter:

1. As far as I know, the cited 1951 Cabinet directive has neither been set aside nor reversed, but was merely modified at the Presidential Cabinet meeting of December 22, 1955 by authorizing the issuance subject to certain conditions of non-quota immigrant visas to alien-wives of Filipino citizens, even if the countries of such alien wives do not admit Filipino citizens for permanent residence; as to Foreign Service Circular No. 271-63, this was, as that Office should be aware of, even reiterated by FSC No. 178-70, issued on October 7, 1970; and consequently such directive and circular are, needless to say, still binding upon consular officials in the performance of their visa functions.

2. It is preposterous to even suggest the idea that the Commission on Immigration and Deportation may modify, revise or set aside the provisions of the cited Cabinet directive and international agreement. True, the Commissioner "has charge of the administration of all laws relating to the immigration of aliens into the Philippines" (Section 3, Com. Act No. 163). But certainly this cannot give him the authority to modify, revise or disregard a Cabinet resolution which is deemed to be and essentially is the act of the President (*Marc Donelly & Associates vs. Agregado*, 95 Phil. 143 [1959]) or an international agreement which has the same force and effect as a statute.

3. If an alien entered the Philippines contrary to the provisions of the said cabinet directive and regulations, no amount of administrative proceedings in the Commission on Immigration and Deportation could "legitimize" such illegal entry. It should be borne in mind that the proceedings in said Commission, like any other administrative proceeding, are conducted for the purpose of determining whether under the immigration laws and regulations a right may be granted or a

status conferred upon an applicant; if not, then it behooves upon the Commission, as a matter of duty, to withhold the grant of the right or the status.

4. If the alien father's entry to the Philippines was illegal, it would only be logical to conclude that his visa cannot be the basis for the issuance of a preference quota visa to any of his relatives. Now only is it fundamental that an illegal act cannot give birth to a right; also, by express

provision of Section 19 of Commonwealth Act No. 613, governing the issuance of preference quota immigration visas to relatives of an alien, the Immigration Commissioner may accord preference only to relatives "*of alien lawfully admitted into the Philippines* for permanent residence and residing therein."

Please be guided accordingly.

(Sgd.) VICENTE ABAD SANTOS
Secretary of Justice

Kagawaran ng Pagawaing Bayan, Sasakyan at Pahatiran

(DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS)

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION
AND COMMUNICATIONS
(LAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION)
QUEZON CITY

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER No. 1
Series of 1975

SUBJECT: UNIFORM FINES AND PENALTIES
FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE PROVISIONS
OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 4136.

Pursuant to the provisions of Republic Act No. 4136, otherwise known as the Land Transportation and Traffic Code, and for the sake of uniformity in the imposition of fines and penalties for violations of the provisions of the Land Transportation and Traffic Code by drivers and operators of motor vehicles, the following scale of penalties is hereby promulgated for the observance of all concerned.

I. *For any of the following offenses:*

1. Operating a motor vehicle recklessly or without reasonable caution;
2. Cutting in and out of the traffic lanes;
3. Cutting corner of blind curve;
4. Making a "U" turn on the approach or on top of a bridge or elsewhere but not at street intersection;
5. Overtaking or passing on curves, at intersections and approaches of bridges, hills and along places where overtaking is prohibited;
6. Coming out of side streets or driveways without precaution;
7. Racing on roads or streets;
8. Failure to stop on entering a "Thru Stop Street";
9. Failure to consider proper clearance when overtaking;
10. Failure to observe right hand rule to yield the "Right of Way" at highway intersection;

11. Driving on the wrong side of the street;
12. Backing against the flow of traffic;
13. Turning from wrong lane;
14. Improper start from parked position;
15. Driving without lights during the hours prescribed by law;
16. Driving against the flow of traffic;
17. Driving or crossing the safety island not intended for motor vehicles;
18. Disregarding automatic signalling devices or lights or any traffic signals, signs or markings;
19. Speeding or fast driving;
20. Entering a "Do Not Enter" street;
21. Disregarding "No Left Turn" sign;
22. Passing thru red light;
23. Allowing passengers in excess of the seating capacity of the front seat.

First offense—P40.00 fine

Second offense—P50.00 fine

Third offense—30 days suspension

Fourth offense—Revocation of drivers' license for two (2) years.

II. *For any of the following offenses:*

1. Obstructing or impeding the free passage of other vehicles;
2. Loading or unloading passengers within a prohibited zone;
3. Soliciting passengers at the street corner;
4. Loading or unloading passengers in the middle of the road;
5. Loading or unloading passengers at intersections;
6. Failure to give right of way to police or other emergency vehicles.

First offense—P30.00 fine

Second offense—P40.00 fine

Third offense—20 days suspension

Fourth offense—3 months suspension

III. *For any of the following offenses:*

1. For parking a motor vehicle or permit it to stand attended or unattended upon a highway in any of the following:
 - a) Within an intersection;
 - b) On a crosswalk or pedestrian lane;
 - c) Within six meters of the intersection of curb lines;
 - d) Within four meters of the driveway entrance to any fire station;
 - e) Within four meters of a fire hydrant;
 - f) In front of a private driveway;
 - g) On the roadway side of any vehicle stopped or parked at the curb or edge of the highway;
 - h) At any place where official signs have been erected prohibiting parking.
2. Parking on sidewalk, path or alley not intended for parking;
3. Failure to carry registration certificate and official receipt of payment of registration fees for current year.

First offense— P10.00 fine

Second offense—P15.00 fine

Third offense—P20.00 fine

Fourth offense—suspension of operation of vehicle for 3 months.

IV. *For any of the following offense:*

1. Driving a motor vehicle without horn or with horns making startling sound;
2. Driving a motor vehicle with open mufflers or making unnecessary noise;
3. Failure to display red flag or red light at the rear end of the load which extend beyond the projected length of the vehicle;
4. Driving a motor vehicle emitting excessive smoke;
5. Driving along the highway without proper permit a motor vehicle with metallic tires;
6. Driving a motor vehicle with dirty, illegible or partly hidden number plates;
7. Driving a motor vehicle with improvised front or rear plate;
8. Operating an "S" vehicle without a commercial or trade name and the words "Not For Hire" painted on both sides of the motor vehicle;
9. Driving a motor truck without capacity markings plainly marked on both sides of motor vehicle;
10. Allowing passengers to ride on running board or hitch to the vehicle;

First offense— P25.00 fine

Second offense—P35.00 fine

Third offense— P45.00 fine

V. *For any of the following offenses:*

1. Driving a motor vehicle without proper headlights, tail lights, stop lights and plate lights;
2. Driving a motor vehicle with broken windshield or without windshield wiper;
3. Driving a motor vehicle with red light forward or ahead of motor vehicle;
4. Driving a motor vehicle without adequate or sufficient brakes, safety devices or accessories;
5. Operating unsafe, unsightly or dilapidated motor vehicle;
6. Driving with inappropriate driver's license;
7. Failure to show or surrender driver's license or conductor's license;
8. Operating a motor vehicle loaded with soil, sand, gravel, stones and the like without canvas covering;

First offense— P30.00 fine

Second offense—P40.00 fine

Third offense— P50.00 fine

For violation of (1) to (5), the apprehended vehicle before resuming operation shall be inspected to verify if the defects have been corrected before releasing the plates, driver's license or other papers confiscated.

For violation of (6) the driver shall be required to secure the appropriate driver's license by complying with existing licensing rules and regulations.

VI. *For any of the following offenses:*

1. Driving with an invalid or delinquent license P50.00 fine
2. Driving without carrying one's driver's license P20.00 fine
3. Failure to sign driver's license P20.00 fine
4. Driving without first securing a driver's license P300.00 fine
5. Operating a motor vehicle with delinquent or suspended or invalid registration P300.00 fine
6. Operating a motor vehicle equipped with unauthorized siren P50.00 fine
7. Driving while under the influence of liquor or narcotic drug—Fine of not less than P200.00 but not more than P500.00 fine
8. Failure to carry one's conductor's license P20.00 fine
9. Serving as a conductor without first securing a conductor's permit P50.00 fine

10. Serving as a conductor with an invalid, suspended or delinquent conductor's permit P50.00 fine
11. Carrying freight or cargo in excess of the registered net carrying capacity—fine based on the excess load as follows:
 - a) P5.00 for every hundred kilograms if motor vehicle is for private use and gasoline fed.
 - b) If motor vehicle is diesel fed the fine shall be 50% more than that of a vehicle using gasoline.
 - c) If motor vehicle is for hire, the fine shall be 60% more than that of vehicle for private use.
12. Hostile or arrogant attitude of a driver or conductor towards lawful authority or improper conduct or behaviour like bribery and other similar offenses.—one month suspension of driver's license or conductor's permit.
13. Transferring, lending or otherwise allowing any person to use his driver's license for the purpose of enabling such person to operate a motor vehicle—P50.00 fine or one month suspension of driver's license.
14. Engaging, employing or hiring any person to operate a motor vehicle other than a duly licensed professional driver—P50.00 fine.

The foregoing constitute the schedule of penalties for settlement of offense which shall be paid immediately to the LTC by the driver or operator.

The application of this Administrative Order to any violator of the Land Transportation and Traffic Code shall be without prejudice to the right of the LTC to compel the violator to comply with licensing and registration requirements.

The Commissioner or his duly authorized representative may require any apprehended driver, especially those apprehended for moving violations, to attend a seminar or lecture on road courtesy and safety and on traffic rules and regulations and take a written driver's examination.

In the event the apprehended driver cannot pay the fine provided herein, his driver's license shall in lieu of the fine, be suspended for such number of days as may be warranted by the circumstances of the case.

Administrative Order No. 1, Series of 1963, and all orders, memoranda, circulars, and rules and regulations, in conflict herewith are deemed amended, superseded and repealed.

This Administrative Order shall take effect upon approval.

(Sgd.) ROMEO F. EDU
Commissioner

Approved:

(Sgd.) DAVID M. CONSUNJI
Secretary
Department of Public Works, Transportation
and Communications

Authenticated:

(Sgd.) ISIDRO R. MAHINAY
(Sr. Exec. Assistant)
Chief, Public Information Division

REPUBLIKA NG PILIPINAS
KAGAWARAN NG PAGAWAING BAYAN, TRANSPORTASYON
AT KOMUNIKASYON
KOMISYON NG TRANSPORTASYONG
PANLUPA
LUNGSOD NG QUEZON

PAKSA: Mga Kaukulang multa at parusa sa paglabag ng mga tadhana ng Batas, Republika Blng. 4136.

KAUTUSANG PAMPANGASIWAAN
BILANG I
Serye ng 1975

Bilang pag-alinsunod sa mga tadhana ng Batas Republika Blng. 4136, na kilala bilang Kodigo ng Transportasyon at Trapikong Panlupa, at upang maging pantay-pantay ang paglalapat ng multa at parusa sa paglabag ng mga tsuper at may-ari ng sasakyang de motor sa mga tadhana ng Kodigo ng Transportasyon at Trapikong Panlupa, ipinahahayag dito ang sumusunod na antas ng mga kaparusahan upang sundin ng lahat ng kinauukulan.

I. *Ukol sa alinman sa mga sumusunod na paglabag:*

1. Padaskul-daskol o walang ingat na pagmamaneho ng sasakyan;
2. Paglabas-masok sa mga linya ng trapiko;
3. Pagsakop sa kabilang kanto ng matalim na kurbada;
4. Pag-"U" liko sa bukana o sa itaas ng tulay o sa iba mang lugar liban sa salikop ng daan;
5. Paglampas sa mga kurbada, sa krosing at bukana ng tulay, mga daang paakyat at sa mga lugar na ipinagbabawal ang paglampas;
6. Walang ingat na paglabas sa mga eskinita o daanan ng garahe;

7. Pagkakarera sa mga kalye o lansangan;
8. Hindi paghinto sa mga kantong may bebalang "Thru Stop Street";
9. Walang pagsasaalang-alang sa wastong pagitan kapag lumalampas;
10. Paglabag sa pagbibigay-daan sa sasakyang nasa kanan sa salikop na haywey;
11. Pagmamaneho sa maling panig ng lansangan;
12. Pag-atras nang pasalungat sa trapiko;
13. Pagliko buhat sa maling linya;
14. Hindi wastong pag-abante mula sa pagkakaparada;
15. Pagmamaneho nang walang ilaw sa mga oras na itinatagubilin ng batas;
16. Pagmamaneho nang pasalungat sa trapiko;
17. Pagmamaneho o pagtawid sa gitnang bangketa na hindi ukol sa mga sasakyang de motor;
18. Pagwawalang-bahala sa mga gamit o ilaw pansenyas o anumang hudyat, babala o palatandaan sa trapiko;
19. Pagiging kaskasero o pagmamaneho nang matulin;
20. Pagpasok sa "Bawal Pumasok" na kalye;
21. Hindi pagpansin sa babalang "Walang Likong Kaliwa";
22. Paglampas sa pulang ilaw;
23. Pagsasakay ng labis sa kayang ilulan ng upuan sa harap.

Unang paglabag	P40.00 multa
Ikalawang paglabag	P50.00 multa
Ikatlong paglabag	30 araw na suspensyon
Ikaapat na paglabag	Pagbawi ng lisensiya sa pagmamaneho sa loob ng dalawang (2) taon,

II. *Ukol sa alin man sa mga sumusunod na paglabag:*

1. Pagabala o pagsagabal sa tuluy-tuloy na pagdaraan ng ibang sasakyan;
2. Pagsasakay o pagbababa ng mga pasahero sa lugar na ipinagbabawal;
3. Pagtawag ng mga pasahero sa kanto;
4. Pagsasakay o pagbababa ng mga pasahero sa gitna ng kalye;
5. Pagsasakay o pagbababa ng mga pasahero sa krosing;
6. Hindi pagbibigay ng daan sa sasakyan ng pulisya o iba pang sasakyang pangkagipitan.

Unang paglabag	P30.00 multa
Ikalawang paglabag	40.00 multa
Ikatlong paglabag	20 araw na suspensyon
Ikaapat na paglabag	3 buwang suspensyon

III. *Ukol sa alinman sa mga sumusunod na pagpaglabag:*

1. Pagpaparada ng sasakyan o pagtitigil nito sa alinman sa mga sumusunod na lugar ng isang lansangang-bayan:
 - a) Sa salikop ng lansangan;
 - b) Sa bangketa o tawiran ng tao;
 - k) Sa sakop na anim na metro mula sa kanto ng paliko;
 - d) Sa sakop na apat na metro mula sa daanan ng sasakyan ng alinmang istasyon ng lumbrero;
 - e) Sa sakop na apat na metro mula sa isang boka-insendiyo;
 - g) Sa harap ng isang pribadong daanan ng garahe;
 - h) Sa pagdaraan ng alinmang sasakyang nakatigil o nakaparada sa tabi ng bangketa o gilid ng lansangang-bayan;
 - i) Sa alinmang lugar na may mga opisyal na babalang nagbabawal pumarada.
2. Pagparada sa bangketa, daanan o eskinitang hindi dapat paradahan;
3. Hindi pagdadala ng sertipiko ng rehistro at opisyal na resibo ng kabayaran sa rehistro para sa kasalukuyang taon.

Unang paglabag	P10.00 multa
Ikalawang paglabag	P15.00 multa
Ikatlong paglabag	P20.00 multa
Ikaapat na paglabag	3 buwang suspensyon sa pagmamaneho.

IV. *Ukol sa alinman sa mga sumusunod na paglabag:*

1. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang walang busina o may businang nakakagulat ang tunog;
2. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyan na nakabukas ang mapler o lumilikha ng hindi narapat na ingay;
3. Hindi paglalagay ng pulang palatandaan o pulang ilaw sa dulo ng kargadang nakausli sa kahabaan ng sasakyan;
4. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang labis na mausek;

5. Pagmamaneho sa lansangang-bayan ng sasakyang may metalikong mga gulong nang walang karapatang pahintulot;
6. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang marumi, hindi mabasa o bahagyang natatakpan ng numero ng plaka;
7. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang may ginawa lamang ang pangharapan o panghulihang plaka;
8. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang "S" nang walang nakapintang pangalang komersyal o pangkalakal at mga salitang "Not For Hire" sa magkabilang tagiliran ng sasakyan;
9. Pagmamaneho ng trak nang hindi malinaw na nakatatak ang kapasidad sa magkabilang tagiliran ng sasakyan;
10. Pagsasakay sa estribo o pagsabit ng pasahero sa sasakyan.

Unang paglabag P25.00 multa

Ikalawang paglabag 35.00 multa

Ikatlong paglabag P45.00 multa

V. *Ukol sa alinman sa mga sumusunod na paglabag:*

1. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang walang maayos na mga ilaw sa harapan, sa hulihan, sa preno at sa plaka;
2. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang basag o walang wayper ang salamin sa harapan;
3. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang may pulang ilaw sa harapan o unahan;
4. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang walang maayos na preno, kagamitan o kasangkapang pangkaligtasan;
5. Pagmamaneho ng peligroso, sira-sira o karag-karag na sasakyan;
6. Pagmamaneho nang walang angkop na lisensya sa pagmamaneho;
7. Hindi pagpapakita o pagbibigay ng lisensya sa pagmamaneho o lisensya ng konduktor;
8. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang may kargang lupa, buhangin, graba bato at mga katulad nito nang walang takip na lona.

Unang paglabag P30.00 multa

Ikalawang paglabag P40.00 multa

Ikatlong paglabag P50.00 multa

Sa pagkalabag ng (1) hanggang (5), iinspeksyunin muna ang nahuling sasakyan bago ito muling patakbuhan upang matiyak na naayos na ang mga depekto bago ibalik ang plaka, lisensya sa pagmamaneho o iba pang kinumpiskang papeles.

Sa pagkalabag ng (6) gailangang kumuha ang tsuper ng nauangkop na lisensya sa pagmamaneho sa pamamagitan ng pagtalima sa mga umiiral na patakaran at alituntunin sa pagbibigay ng lisensya.

VI. *Ukol sa alinman sa mga sumusunod na paglabag:*

1. Pagmamaneho nang paso o wala ng bisa ang lisensya P 50.00 multa
2. Pagmamaneho nang hindi dala ang lisensya sa pagmamaneho P 20.00 multa
3. Walang pirmang lisensya sa pagmamaneho P 20.00 multa
4. Pagmamaneho nang wala pang lisensya sa pagmamaneho P300.00 multa
5. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang paso o sinuspindi o wala ng bisa ang rehistro P300.00 multa
6. Pagmamaneho ng sasakyang kinabitan ng sirena nang walang pahintulot P 50.00 multa
7. Pagmamaneho nang lasing o nasa bisa ng narkotiko—Multang hindi kukulangin sa P200.00 subalit hindi hihigit sa P500.00 multa
8. Hindi pagdadala ng sariling lisensya sa pagkakonductor P 20.00 multa
9. Pagkokonductor nang walang pahintulot magkonduktor P 50.00 multa
10. Pagkokonductor nang paso, sinuspindi o wala nang bisa ang pahintulot magkonduktor P 50.00 multa
11. Pagdadala ng kargada na labis sa nakarehistrong kayang ilulan—multang batay sa kalabisan gaya ng sumusunod:
 - a) P5.00 sa bawat isandaang kilo kung ang sasakyan ay pansariling gamit at de-gasolina.
 - b) Kung ang sasakyan ay de-krudo ang multa ay 50% mas higit sa sasakyang de-gasolina.
 - c) Kung ang sasakyan ay pinauupahan, ang multa ay 60 % mas higit sa sasakyang pansariling gamit.

12. Pagbabarumbado o pagmamamangag ng isang tsuper o konduktor sa alagad ng batas o maling kilos o asal gaya ng panunuhol at iba pang katulad na paglabag—isang buwang suspensyon ng lisensya sa pagmamamaneho o pahintulot magkonduktor.
13. Paglilipat, pagpapahiram o P50.00 multa o dili kaya'y pagpapahintulot isang buwang sa sinumang tao na gamitin ang kanyang lisensya suspensyon ng sa pagmamamaneho upang lisensya sa pagmakapagmamaneho ang nasa-bing tao
14. Pagkuha o pag-upa sa sinumang tao upang magmamaneho ng sasakyan maliban sa karampatang may lisensyang propesyonal na tsuper P 50.00 multa

Isinasaad sa mga naunang binanggit ang talaan ng parusang ipapataw sa mga paglabag na kailangang bayaran agad sa KTP ng tsuper o may-ari.

Ang paglalapat ng Kautusang Pampangasiwaang ito sa sinumang lumabag sa Kodigo ng Transportasyon at Trapikong Panlupa ay hindi mag-aalis sa karapatan ng KTP na sapilitang ipatupad sa nagkasala ang mga hinhiingi sa pagpaparehistro at pagkuha ng lisensya.

Ang Komisyonado o ng kanyang may karampatang pahintulot na kinatawan ay maaring hingin

sa nahuling tsuper, laluna yaong mga lumabag sa pagmamamaneho, na dumalo sa isang seminar o pag-aaral tungkol sa paggalang pakikipagbigayan sa kapwa nagmamamaneho at kaligtasan sa pagmamaneho at sa mga patakaran at alituntunin ng trapiko at kumuha ng nakasulat na pagsusulit tungkol sa pagmamamaneho.

Kapag hindi kayang bayaran ng nahuling tsuper ang multang itinatakda dito, sa halip ng multa, ang kanyang lisensya sa pagmamamaneho ay isususpindi sa loob ng taning na panahong magbibigaymatwid sa mga pangyayaring may kinalaman sa kaso.

Ang Kautusang Pampangasiwaan Bldg., I, Serye ng 1963, at lahat ng kautusan, memorandum, sirkular, at mga patakaran at alituntunin, na salungat dito ay itinuturing na sinusugan, pinalitan at walong bisa.

Magkakabisa ang Kautusang Pampangasiwaang ito sa oras na pagtibayin.

(Ldg.) ROMEO F. EDU
Komisyonado

Pinagtibay:

(Ldg.) DAVID M. CONSUNJI
Kalihim

Kagawaran ng Pagawaing Bayan, Transportasyon
at Pahatiran

Pinatunayan:

(Ldg.) ISIDRO R. MAHINAY
(Pangunang Kawaksi Tagapagpaganap)

Puno, Sangay ng Kabatirang Pang-madla

Kagawaran ng Kalusugan

(DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH)

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
MANILA

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER No. 242
Series of 1975

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER No. 184, SERIES OF 1972 CONCERNING THE COST OF BLOOD.

SECTION 1.—The provisions of Section 5 of Administrative Order No. 184, series of 1972, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Section 5—Human blood shall not be subject of public bidding. It may be procured from licensed blood banks at cost. The costs of the different types of human blood are as follows:

TYPE A	P55.00 per 500 cc.
TYPE B	P55.00 per 500 cc.
TYPE O	P55.00 per 500 cc.
TYPE SB	P65.00 per 500 cc.

If plastic bags are utilized, an additional cost of P5.00 may be added. An additional cost of P25.00 for each type of human blood may be charged if all the following tests are undertaken (1) microhematocrit; (2) Spectrophotometric determination of hemoglobin; and (3) detection of Australian antigen.

An "honorarium" fee of at least P30.00 shall be given a qualified donor to cover his meal, transportation, and other expenses".

SEC. 2.—This amendment shall take effect upon approval and publication as required.

(Sgd.) CLEMENTE S. GATMAITAN
M.D., M.P.H.
Secretary of Health

Approved:
May 7, 1975

Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas

(CENTRAL BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES)

CENTRAL BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES

MANILA

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

MEMORANDUM TO AUTHORIZED AGENT BANKS

Effective immediately, all applications for the importation and release certificates of "EP 011-01.00- *Meat of bovine cattle-beef, veal*" either thru Letters of Credit, Documents Against Acceptances or Open Account arrangements or any other manner of payments shall be referred to the Current Imports and Commodity Classification Office, Central Bank, for prior approval.

Please be guided accordingly.

(Sgd.) G. S. LICAROS
Governor

April 21, 1975
(MAAB No. 30)

BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS
(CENTRAL BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES)
MAYNILA, PILIPINAS

MEMORANDUM

COMMITTEE ON SAVINGS

CIRCULAR-LETTER

April 28, 1975

To: All Banks

In accordance with the agreement reached in the conference held on February 20, 1975, between the Central Bank Committee on Savings and the banking sector represented by bank officers designated by the different associations (see attached Annex A), the advertising expenses of the National Savings for Progress Campaign for the period from January to June, 1975, estimated at P950,000.00 will be shared to the extent of 50% or P475,000.00 each by the Central Bank and the banking community. Please note that banks will share only in the regular advertising expense of the campaign. Expenses connected with other special projects of the National Savings for Progress Campaign, such as regional launching, workshop on savings, printing and distribution of newsletter and primer, production of documentary films, administrative expenses, etc., are being shouldered solely by the Central Bank.

The share of the banking sector will be allocated among member banks as follows:

	Amount	Per Cent
Commercial Banks	P287,950.00	65
Thrift Banks	P 44,300.00	10
Savings Banks (excluding Phil. Postal Savings Bank)	P 22,150.00	5
Private Development Banks	13,290.00	3
Stock Savings & Loan Assns.	8,860.00	2
Regional or Rural Banks	P110,750.00	25
Sub-Total	P443,000.00	100
Specialized & Unique Banks— Development Bank of the Philippines	P 20,000.00	
Land Bank of the Phil- ippines	10,000.00	
Philippine Amanah Bank	2,000.00	
Total	P475,000.00	

The assessment for Commercial and Thrift Banks shall be in proportion to their total assets held as of December 31, 1974, but in no case shall it be less than P150.00 per bank. For Rural Banks, the assessment is at a flat rate of P165.00 per bank.

As usual, the Central Bank Accounting Department will bill all the concerned banks individually, based on the assessment furnished by the respective supervising departments.

Thank you for your continuous support and co-operation.

(Sgd.) ESCOLASTICA B. BINCE
Chairman

Attachment:

Annex "A"

Conference between the Central Bank Committee
on Savings and the Different Banking Groups
Held on February 20, 1975, at the Executive Lounge
Central Bank 5-Storey Building

Name of Representative	Bankers Association/Bank
Mr. Emmanuel L. Osorio	Philippine Amanah Bank
Mr. Noli B. Bajada	Land Bank of the Philippines
Mr. Oscar C. Katindig	Philippine National Bank
Mr. E. Nuguid, Jr.	Philippine National Bank
Mr. Onofre G. Ferrer	Development Bank of the Philippines
Mr. Alfonso P. Ansaldo	Development Bank of the Philippines

Mr. Fausto Rodil Development Bankers Association of the Philippines

Mr. Renato P. Dragon .. Philippine League of Savings & Loan Association

Miss Rita B. Manuel Savings Bankers Association of the Philippines

Mr. Antonio V. Viray .. Savings Bankers Association of the Philippines

Mr. Carlos Mora Republic Bank

Mr. Teodulo A. Catindig Bankers Association of the Philippines

Mr. Rodolfo O. Desiderio Rural Bankers Association of the Philippines

Mr. Ramon V. Jarviña .. Savings Bankers Association of the Philippines

BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS
(CENTRAL BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES)
MAYNILA, PILIPINAS

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

MEMORANDUM TO AUTHORIZED AGENT
BANKS AND AUTHORIZED SECURITY
DEALERS.

Further to MAAB No. 89 dated August 9, 1974 governing switching transactions in CB-approved Philippine securities listed in the stock exchanges authorized under Circular 365 as implemented by Memorandum to Authorized Agent Banks and Au-

thorized Security Dealers Dated March 26, 1973, the following regulations are hereby promulgated:

1. Cash dividends and proceeds of sale of stock dividends accruing on foreign cash investments in Philippine securities registered pursuant to Circular 365, may be re-invested in other Philippine securities listed in the stock exchanges and registered under the provisions of Circular 365.
2. Pending the re-investment/repatriation of peso cash dividends/proceeds of sale of stock dividends, the same shall, at the option of the foreign investor, be lodged with the selling authorized security dealer or in a "suspense account" (not a deposit account) with any authorized agent bank.
3. A monthly report on the prescribed form, sample attached hereto, indicating every entry in the said peso account of each investor, shall be accomplished and submitted to the Foreign Exchange Department, Central Bank of the Philippines, not later than five (5) days after the end of every month by the authorized agent bank/authorized security dealer concerned.
4. Provisions of existing regulations inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

This Memorandum shall take effect immediately.

(Sgd.) G. S. LICAROS
Governor

April 21, 1975
(MAAB No. 29)
Attached: as stated.

CBP-FED

STATEMENT OF PESO ACCOUNT ARISING FROM CASH DIVIDENDS/
PROCEEDS OF SALE OF STOCK DIVIDENDS ON REGISTERED
INVESTMENTS PURSUANT TO CIRCULAR 365 HELD BY

SUBMISSION:

Not later than five (5)
days at the end of the
month.

(Name of Authorized Security Dealer/Authorized Agent Bank)

For Account of:

(Name of Foreign Investor)

For the Month of, 197....

BALANCE Beginning of the Month

P.....

ADD: A. Cash Dividends:¹

Security	FED-STD No.	Shs. Outsdq.	Rec. Date/Rate	Net Amount
.....	P.....

B. Sale of Stock Dividends:¹

Security	FED-STD No.	Shs. Outsdq.	Rec. Date/Rate	Sales Trans. No.	No. of Shs. Sold	Value of Sales
.....	P.....

P.....

LESS: C. Reinvestments:²

Security	Trans. No.	No. of Shs.	Value of Investment
.....	P.....

P.....

D. Remittance/Repatriation:

Date Authorized	Remitting Bank	Amount
.....	P.....

P.....

Balance, Forwarded

P.....

Certified true and correct under paid of perjury
and the penal provisions of R.A. 265, as amended.

¹ To be supported by the relative Divident Notice
² Attach copy of CBP-6-22-26 and confirmation slip/s

(Signature of Authorized Officer Over Printed Name)

MGA PAHAYAG NA LEGAL AT OPISYAL

(LEGAL AND OFFICIAL NOTICES)

Hukumang Unang Dulugan

(COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)

[FIRST PUBLICATION]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BATAAN
FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH I

CADASTRAL CASE No. 20 LRC (GLRO) CADASTRE
RECORD No. 1384 Plan G-11894 Lot No. 1307.—
Re: Petition for Reconstitution of Original
Certificate of Title No. (N.A.)

GONZALO DOMINGO, Petitioner

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: The Director of Printing, Manila; Gonzalo Domingo, Victoria Ricablanca, Leoncia Manzano, all of Morong, Bataan, Rosario Ricablanca of Bagac, Bataan, and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been filed in this Court by Gonzalo Domingo, under the provisions of Republic Act 26, for the reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title No. (N.A.), copy of said title was alleged to have been lost in the possession of the original owner during the last war and the original thereof was likewise lost and/or destroyed in the office of the Register of Deeds of Balanga, Bataan, also as a consequence of said war, covering a parcel of land known as Lot No. 1307 of the Cadastral Survey of Morong, located in the Municipality of Morong, Bataan, and bounded as follows:

On the SW., NW., NE. & SE.,—By Public Land.

Area: 92,906 Square Meters, more or less.

Wherefore, you are hereby given notice that said petition has been set for hearing on July 22, 1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the morning in the Sala of this Court at the Provincial Capitol, Balanga, Bataan, at which date, time and place aforesaid, you should appear and file your objections, if any, to the said petition.

Witness, the Honorable Abraham P. Vera, Judge of this Court, this 16th day of April, 1975.

(Sgd.) ANTONIO C. QUINTOS
Branch Clerk of Court

[20, 21]

084766—7

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU
FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH XVI, LAPU-LAPU CITY

CADASTRAL CASE No. 19 LRC RECORD No. 1003 Lot
No. 892 Opon Cadastre

CADASTRAL CASE No. 15 LRC Record No. 905 Lot
No. 295 Opon Cadastre

THE DIRECTOR OF LANDS, Petitioner, *versus* CORNELIO AGUJAR, ET AL., Claimants, EULALIA AGUJAR, ET AL., Claimants; MARCELO TAMPUS, Movant.

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Ramon Codilla, Lapu-Lapu City; Marcelo Tampus, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City; The Register of Deeds, Lapu-Lapu City; Marcelino Ybañez, Basak, Lapu-Lapu City; Tomasa Aguilar, Basak, Lapu-Lapu City; Pablo Ybañez, Basak, Lapu-Lapu City; Eulalia Aguilar, Basak, Lapu-Lapu City; Maximo Ybañez, Basak, Lapu-Lapu City; Cornelio Ybañez, Basak, Lapu-Lapu City; Petronilo Ngujo, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City; Anastacio Patalingjug, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City; Eugenia Baring, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City; Raymundo Baring, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City; Sotero Ybañez, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City.

GREETINGS:

Please take notice that the petition filed with this Court by Marcelo Tampus, thru counsel, Atty. Ramon Codilla, seeking for the reconstitution of the Original Certificates of Titles of Lots Nos. 892 and 295, is set for hearing on July 11, 1975 at 9:00 o'clock in the morning before the 16th Branch of this Court, located at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

Lots Nos. 892 and 295 are situated at barrio Basak and Looc, Lapu-Lapu City, respectively and bounded by the properties of the last 11 aforementioned persons.

Witness, the Honorable Ramon E. Nazareno, Presiding Judge of this Court, this 23rd day of April, 1975, at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

(Sgd.) PATERNO M. ROSAL
Clerk of Court

[20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU
FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH XVI, LAPU-LAPU CITY

CADASTRAL CASE No. 22 LRC RECORD No. 1018 Lot
No. 6020 Opon Cadastre

THE DIRECTOR OF LANDS, Petitioner, *versus* FLO-
RENCIA ABADIA, ET AL., Claimants

EUFACIO BUTALID, MOVANT

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Pedro T. Garcia, Q. Rodriguez Bldg.,
Cebu City; Eufacio Butalid, Sabang, Lapu-
Lapu City; The Register of Deeds, Lapu-Lapu
City; Claudio Cabilac, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu
City; Rufo Colina Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City;
Natalio Evangelista, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City;
Vicente Mata, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City;
Anastacio Tatoy, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City;
Pablo Butalid, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City;
Julian Nanoy, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City;

GREETINGS:

Please take notice that the petition filed with
this Court by Eufacio Butalid, thru counsel Atty.
Pedro T. Garcia, seeking for the reconstitution
of the Original Certificate of Title of Lot No.
6020, Opon Cadastre, is set for hearing on July
11, 1975 at 9:00 o'clock in the morning before
the 16th Branch of this Court located at Lapu-Lapu
City, Philippines.

Lot No. 6020 is situated at barrio Sta. Rosa,
Lapu-Lapu City and bounded by the properties of
the last 7 aforementioned persons.

You are therefore ordered to appear at the
date, time and place of hearing herein designated
and to show cause if there is any why the said
petition should not be granted.

Witness, the Honorable Ramon E. Nazareno, Pre-
siding Judge of this Court, this 23rd day of April,
1975, at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

(Sgd.) PATERNO M. ROSAL
[20, 21] Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU
FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
CEBU CITY
BRANCH V

CADASTRAL CASE No. 10, LRC Record No. 9466
Lot No. 2097, Cebu Cadastre

THE DIRECTOR OF LANDS, Petitioner *vs.* AGUEDO
ABADILLA, ET AL., Claimants

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Messrs. Tranquilino Quijano, South Express-
way; Luis Luardo, 103 Logarta Street; Maxi-

mino Vasquez, 806-B, Tabada Street; & Eddie
Woolbright, % Eddie's Log Cabin, all of Cebu
City, Philippines; the Register of Deeds of Cebu
City, and to all whom it may concern:

GREETINGS:

Please take notice that the petition filed with this
Court by Flordeluz Gatón thru counsel, Atty. Efren
V. Ramirez, seeking for the reconstitution of the
Original Certificate of Title in the above-entitled
lot No. 2097, is set for hearing on July 2, 1975, at
8:30 A.M. before the fifth branch of this Court
located at the Capitol Building, Cebu City, Philip-
pines.

Lot No. 2097 is situated at South Expressway,
Cebu City, Philippines, and bounded by real prop-
erties of Messrs. Tranquilino Quijano, Luis Luardo,
Maximino Vasquez and Eddie Woolbright.

You are hereby requested to appear at the date,
time and place herein designated and to show cause
if any you have why said petition should not be
granted.

Witness, the Honorable Mariano A. Zosa, Presid-
ing Judge of Branch V of this Court, this April 24,
1975, at Cebu City.

(Sgd.) Atty. GERONIMO V. NAZARETH
[20, 21] Branch Clerk, Branch V

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF COTABATO
SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
FIRST BRANCH
COTABATO CITY

SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS CASE No. 180 B.L. PLAN H-
177363—In Re: Petition for the Reconstitution
of Homestead Patent Original Certificate of
Title No. 2016 in the Name of Kalaing Balao.

DADO KALAING, Petitioner

NOTICE

To: Atty. Macabañgan Alamada, counsel for the
petitioner—Biruar Building, Cotabato City;
Brahim Timbao % Mustapha Brahim—Katuly,
Sultan Kudarat—Isulan, Sultan Kudarat and
Land Officer of Land District No. XI-8 (for
the adjoining Public Lands) Tacurong, Sultan
Kudarat; The Provincial Register of Deeds of
Sultan Kudarat—Isulan, Sultan Kudarat and
to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition dated March 20, 1975, has
been filed with this Court under the provisions of
Republic Act No. 26, Dado Kalaing of Salaman,
Lebak, Sultan Kudarat, for the reconstitution of
homestead patent Original Certificate of Title No.
2016, issued in the name of Kalaing Balao by the
Register of Deeds of the former Province of Cota-
bato, covering the real property described in B.L.

Plan H-177363, situated in Tran, Lebak, Sultan Kudarat, and bounded:

on the NE., by Public Land; on the SE., by Public Land; on the SW., by property of Brahim Timbao, H-170013; and on the NW., by property of Kalaing Balao, F-46897; with an area of 229,630 square meters, more or less.

Therefore, you are hereby given notice that said petition has been set for hearing on July 24, 1975, at 8:30 A.M. before this Court in its session hall in the City of Cotabato, Philippines, on which date, time and place you should appear and file your claims or objections, if you have any to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Glicerio V. Carriaga, Jr. Judge of said Court, this 17th day of April, 1975.

BENJAMIN N. MUÑASQUE

By: Clerk of Court

(Sgd.) EMILIANO G. DE VERA

[20, 21] Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF ILOILO
ELEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

CADASTRAL CASE No. 17 GLRO RECORD No. 17 Lot No. 2449 (Mandurriao)—Original Certificate of Title No. 14636

SALVACION OYSON OCHAYA, Petitioner

NOTICE

To: Madam Salvacion Oyson de Ochava, Court of Appeals, Manila, Atty. Eugenio G. Gemarino. Iznart Street, Iloilo City; The Register of Deeds of Iloilo, Iloilo City; The Bureau of Lands % The District Land Officer, Iloilo City; The Commissioner of Land Registration, Quezon City; and to all concerned.

A verified petition filed with this Court on April 15, 1975, praying for the reconstitution under R.A. No. 26 of Original Certificate of Title No. 14636, covering Lot No. 2449 of Mandurriao Cadastre, alleges among others, that the herein petitioner is one of the heirs of Severo Oyson, one of the registered owners of Lot No. 2449 of Mandurriao Cadastre with Original Certificate of Title No. 14636; that the original copy of the Original Certificate of Title No. 14636 was totally lost and/or destroyed; that likewise the owner's duplicate copy of the aforesaid Original Certificate of Title No. 14636 has long been lost in the possession of the petitioner and diligent efforts were exerted to locate it but the same could not be found; that the technical descriptions of this lot is hereto attached and made integral part of the petition; that also attached herewith is the sketch plan of the said lot; that no co-owner's mortgagee's or lessee's duplicate certificate of title was issued; that the area of the said is 710 square meters, and that the

boundaries are as follows: on the NE., by Calle de Leon; on the SE., by Lot No. 2460, Luis Cambroner and de Leon Street; on the SW., by Lot No. 2429; Hermogenes Escarilla; and NW., by Calle Cementerio; that the name and address of the occupant of the lot is Hermogenes Escarilla of Onate Street, Mandurriao, Iloilo City.

Wherefore, notice is hereby given that the above-entitled case is set for hearing at 8:30 A.M. on September 30, 1975 before the 1st Branch of this Court.

Witness, the Hon. Sancho Y. Inserto, Presiding Judge of the 1st Branch of this Court, this 16th day of April, 1975 in the City of Iloilo, Philippines.

(Sgd.) SALVADOR V. SOLIS

[20, 21] Acting Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LAGUNA
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH II

CADASTRAL CASE No. 3 GLRO RECORD No. 183 Lot 2426, Lumban Cadastre—In Re: Petition for Judicial Reconstitution of Title

SALVADOR UNSON, JR., MYRNA UNSON, ELMA UNSON and NAYDA UNSON, Petitioners.

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: The Register of Deeds, Santa Cruz, Laguna; Atty. Zorayda H. Caballero, Pedro Lanuza and Salvador Unson, all of Pagsanjan, Laguna; the Municipal Mayor, Isaias del Valle, Wenceslao Tabia, Felix Gaza, Felisa Guevarra, Pedro Tablico and Conrado Evarbia, all of Lumban, Laguna; and to all whom these may concern:

Whereas, the above-named petition filed with this Court alleges that Original Certificate of Title No. (not available) of the land records of Laguna, issued in the name of Salvador Unson of Pagsanjan, Laguna, covered the parcel of land particularly described as follows:

"A parcel of land (Lot 2426 of the cadastral survey of Lumban, Cad-90, LRC Rec. No., situated in the Barrio of Wawa, Municipality of Lumban, Province of Laguna. Bounded on the SW., by Lot 2453 of Cad-90, Lumban Cadastre; on the W., by the Catayugan Creek, Lot 2427; on the NW., by Lot 2425, 2424, 2414, 2413 and 2412, all of Cad-90, Lumban Cadastre; on the NE., by Lumban River; on the SE., by Lot 2462 and 2460, both of Cad-90, Lumban Cadastre; and on the W., by Catayugan Creek and Lot 2453 of Cad-90, Lumban Cadastre. Containing an area of three hundred seventeen thousand three hundred eighty two (317,382) square meters."

that the original and owner's duplicate thereof were lost or destroyed during the last world war; and that the petitioners are heirs of the registered owners;

Therefore, you are hereby given notice that the petition is set for hearing on August 21, 1975 at 8:30 a.m. before the Second Branch of this Court at Santa Cruz, Laguna, on which date, time and

place, you should appear to file and establish your claim or objection, if any you have, to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Gabriel V. Valero, Judge of this Court, this 4th day of March, 1975 at Santa Cruz, Laguna.

(Sgd.) FRANCISCO S. ABELLA
Clerk of Court

[20, 21]

Komisyon sa Patalaan ng Lupain (LAND REGISTRATION COMMISSION)

[FIRST PUBLICATION]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF AGUSAN
DEL NORTE AND BUTUAN CITY

Land Registration Case No. N-209
LRC Record No. N-45790

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. X-2, Butuan City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Valeria Lagangga, Adelaida M. Esguerra, Marcelino Lecote, the heirs of Pedro Lecote, Cabadbaran, Agusan del Norte; and to all whom it may concern;

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Ignacio A. Beray, Cabadbaran, Agusan del Norte, assisted by Rogelio P. Dagani Cabadbaran Agusan del Norte, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-228105) with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Cabadbaran, Province of Agusan. Bounded on the NE., by property of Adelaida M. Esguerra; on the SE., by property of Marcelino Lecote; on the SW., by Funcion Street and on the NW., by the Asis Street. Point "1" is S. 7 deg. 19 min. W., 163.54 meters from BLLM 1, Cabadbaran, Agusan. Area two hundred forty-seven (247) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Agusan del Norte, at its session to be held in the City of Butuan, Philippines, on the 11th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid your default will be recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Vicente B. Echavas, Jr. Judge of said Court, the 4th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

[20, 21]

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BULACAN

Land Registration Case No. N-3321
LRC Record No. N-46786

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Malolos, Bulacan; the District Land Office No. III-6, Tabang, Guiguinto, Bulacan; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Heirs of Francisco Villanueva, Servillano Roxas, Maria Samonte, Lorenza Villanueva, Fermin Paras, Enriqueta Catindig, and Marcos Roxas, Taliptip, Bulacan, Bulacan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Seravia Pantalcon, Deogracias Roxas, Maria Sofia Roxas, Ceferina Roxas, Maria Paz Roxas, Primitivo Roxas, Teodora Roxas, and Lucilo dela Cruz Jr., Taliptip, Bulacan, Bulacan; assisted by Atty. Mario A. Batongbacal, Becaue, Bulacan, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of Taliptip, Municipality of Bulacan, Province of Bulacan. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-115387). Bounded on the NE., by property of the Heirs of Francisco Villanueva; on the SE., by property of Maria Samonte; on the SW., Lot 2 claimed by the Provincial Government of Bulacan; and on the NW., by property of Servillano Roxas. Point "1" is S. 30 deg. 22 min. E., 3,586.00 meters from BLLM 1, Bulacan, Bulacan. Area one thousand two hundred forty-nine (1,249) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-115387). Bounded on the NE., by Lot 1; on the SE., by property of Maria Samonte; on the SW., by Provincial Road to Bulacan; and on the NW., by property of Servillano Roxas. Point "1" is S. 30 deg. 22 min. E., 3,586.00 meters from BLLM 1, Bulacan, Bulacan. Area seventy (70) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Bulacan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Malolos, Province of Bulacan, Philippines, on the 28th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Jesus R. De Vega, Judge of said Court, the 25th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division [20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAGAYAN

Land Registration Case No. S-33
LRC Record No. N-46820

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. II-1, Tuguegarao, Cagayan; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Orlando Arjonillo and Amador Agulan, Sanchez Mira, Cagayan; and the Heirs of Isidoro Pulido, Centro, Sanchez Mira, Cagayan; and Benjamin Ligot, 217, Biak-na-Bato Street, San Juan, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Remedios Pulido-Ligot, 217 Biak-na-Bato Street, San Juan, Rizal, assisted by Atty.

Conrado A. Ruiz, Sanchez Mira, Cagayan, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-254132), situated in the Barrio of Centro, Municipality of Sanchez Mira, Province of Cagayan. Bounded on the NE., by property of Orlando Arjonillo; on the SE., by property of Amador Agulan; on the SW., by the Maizán Street; and on the NW., by the Lagasca Street. Point "1" is S. 61 deg. 27 min. E., 138.88 meters from BLLM 1, Sanchez Mira, Cagayan Pls-746. Area one thousand nine hundred seventy-three (1,973) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cagayan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Sanchez Mira, Province of Cagayan, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 8:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Jose P. Castro, Judge of said Court, the 7th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division [20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF
CAMARINES SUR

Land Registration Case No. N-1543
LRC Record No. N-46897

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the District Land Office No. V-2, Naga City; the Highway District Engineer, Baras, Canaman, Camarines Sur; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Canaman, Camarines Sur; Primitiva Tinao Castillo, Luis Balondo, Sebastian Bermillo, Jose San Carlos, Amado San

Carlos, Gregorio Nicomedes and Miguel Silvestre, Haring, Canaman, Camarines Sur; Lazaro Alejandro and Salud Marquez, Lerma St., Naga City; the Rector, Nueva Caceres Seminary, Elias Angeles St., Naga City; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Esteban H. Castillo, Haring Canaman, Camarines Sur, thru Atty. Andres C. Regalado, Naga City, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-05-000418), with the building and improvements thereon situated in the Barrio of Haring, Municipality of Canaman, Province of Camarines Sur. Bounded on the N. by property of Sebastian Bermillo; on the NE. by properties of Luis-Balondo and Lazaro Alejandro; on the E., by properties of Lazaro Alejandro and Miguel Silvestre; on the S., by Nueva Caceres Seminary; on the SW., by property of Amado San Carlos; and on the W., by properties of Amado San Carlos and Jose San Carlos. Point "1" is N. 21 deg. 51 min. E., 258.11 meters from MBM 22, Naga Cadastre. Area one thousand twenty (1,020) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Camarines Sur, at its session to be held in the City of Naga, Philippines, on the 25th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Rafael Dela Cruz, Judge of said Court, the 19th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE

Land Registration Case No. N-1158
LRC Record No. N-46887

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform,

Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Trece Martires City; the District Land Office No. IV-1, Rosario, Cavite; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Heirs of Gil Benitez, Raymundo Alvarez, Pacifico Aquino and Isabel Alvarez, Noveleta, Cavite; Maxima Alvarez, Pablo Alvarez, Maximo Alvarez, Isaac Gandoza, San Rafael, Noveleta, Cavite; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Petrona R. Alvarez, Noveleta, Cavite, assisted by Atty. Alfredo E. Lazaro, Kawit, Cavite, to register and confirm her title to the following properties:

Five (5) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of San Rafael, Municipality of Noveleta, Province of Cavite. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-241134 Amd), bounded on the NE., and SE., by properties of Maxima Alvarez and Pablo Alvarez, et al; on the S., and SW. by property of the Heirs of Gil Benitez; on the W., by property of Pacifico Aquino; and on the NW., by Lot 2, (Road). Point "1" is N., 0 deg. 27 min. E., 928.50 meters from BLLM 10, Cad-204, Noveleta Cadastre. Area three thousand six hundred twenty-one (3,621) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-241134 Amd), bounded on the NE., by properties of Maxima and Pablo Alvarez, et al.; on the SE., by Lot 1; on the W., by property of Pacifico Aquino; and on the NW., by Lots 3, 5 (Road) and 4. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 21 min. W., 1,006.14 meters from BLLM 10, Cad-204, Noveleta Cadastre. Area five hundred fifty-nine (559) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (Lot 3, plan Psu-241134 Amd), bounded on the NE., by Lot 5 (Road); on the SE., by Lot 2 (Road); on the W., by property of Pacifico Aquino; and on the NW., by Lot 4. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 42 min. W., 1,002.88 meters from BLLM 10, Cad-204, Noveleta Cadastre. Area two thousand six hundred ninety (2,690) square meters, more or less.

4. A parcel of land (Lot 4, plan Psu-241134 Amd), bounded on the NE., by properties of Maxima and Pablo Alvarez, et al; on the SE., by Lot 2 (Road); on the SW., by Lots 5 (Road) and 3 and by properties of Pacifico Aquino and Raymundo Alvarez; and on the NW., by property of Raymundo Alvarez. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 21 min. W., 1,006.14 meters from BLLM 10 Cad-204, Noveleta Cadastre.

Area two thousand six hundred ninety (2,690) square meters, more or less.

5. A parcel of land (Lot 5, plan Psu-241134 Amd.), bounded on the NE., and NW., by Lot 4; on the SE., by Lot 2 (Road); and on the SW., by Lots 3 and 4. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 21 min. W., 1,006.14 meters from BLLM 10, Cad-204, Noveleta Cadastre. Area eight hundred twenty-eight (828) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cavite, at its session to be held in the City of Cavite, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ernani Cruz Paño, Judge of said Court, the 2nd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:
GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE

Land Registration Case No. N-1159
LRC Record No. N-46888

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Trece Martires City; the District Land Office No. IV-1, Rosario, Cavite; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Kawit, Cavite; the Heirs of Marcela Baja, Putol, Kawit, Cavite; and Delfin Colina, 2328 Gregorio del Pilar St., Singalong, Manila; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Rosita Cafuir 2328 Gregorio del Pilar Street, Singalong, Manila, thru Atty. Ladislao C. Agahan, c/o Agahan Law Office, Kawit, Cavite,

to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-241699) situated in the Barrio of Putol, Municipality of Kawit, Province of Cavite. Bounded on the NE., by a Canal; on the SE., by the National Road; on the SW., by property of the Heirs of Marcela Baja; and on the NW., by National Highway. Point "1" is S. 46 deg. 49 min. W., 2,038.95 meters from BLLM 1, Kawit, Cavite. Area one hundred fifty-two (152) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cavite, at its session to be held in the City of Cavite, Philippines, on the 18th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ernani Cruz Paño, Judge of said Court, the 2nd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:
GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU

Land Registration Case No. N-967
LRC Record No. N-46697

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VII-1, Cebu City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Buenaventura Guaca, Francisco Flores, Narciso Reyes, Consolacion, Cebu; Maura Naya, Dionisio Bihag, Apolinario Siacor, Aurelio Alivio, Leoncio Nuñez and Luciano Gonzaga, Casili, Consolacion, Cebu; Luciano Bihag, Victoria Reuyan, Marciano Reuyan and Juana Reuyan, Pulog, Consolacion, Cebu; Heirs of Alipio Jordan c/o Nicolas Jordan, Poblacion, Liloan.

Cebu; Eulalia Neis, Bo. Stacionan, Consolacion, Cebu; and Jesus Go, Mandaue City; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Cebcon Incorporated, Franco Bldg., Mandaue Highway, Mandaue City; represented by its President Luis V. Velez, Gorordo Avenue, Cebu City, thru Atty. Ponciano H. Alivio, Consolacion, Cebu; to register and confirm its title to the following properties:

1. A parcel of land (plan Psu-07-01-000239), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Casili, Municipality of Consolacion, Province of Cebu. Bounded on the N., by properties of Leoncio Nuñez, Luciano Bihag and the Heirs of Alipio Jordan; on the NE., by properties of Luciano Gonzaga and Cebcon Incorporated; on the SE. and S., by properties of Cebcon Incorporated and Maura Naya; on the SW., by properties of Buenaventura Guaca, Dionisio Bihag, Apolinario Siacor and Aurelio Alivio; and on the NW., by property of Eulalia Neis. Point "1" N. 75 deg. 55 min. W., 1,189.52 meters from BLLM 1, Consolacion, Cebu. Area thirty thousand two hundred eighteen (30,218) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (plan Psu-07-01-000273), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Polpugan, Municipality of Consolacion, Province of Cebu. Bounded on the NE., by property of Victoria Reuyan; on the SE., by property of Marciano Reuyan; and on the SW. and NW., by property of Cebcon Incorporated. Point "1" is N. 59 deg. 15 min. W., 435.23 meters from BLLM 1, Consolacion, Cebu. Area three thousand two hundred twenty (3,220) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (plan Psu-07-01-000274), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Consolacion, Province of Cebu. Bounded on the N., by property of Jesus Go; on the NE., by property of Cebcon Incorporated; on the SE., by properties of Juana Reuyan and Marciano Reuyan; and on the SW., by property of Francisco Flores. Point "1" is S. 78 deg. 18 min. W., 574.08 meters from BLLM 1, Consolacion, Cebu. Area one thousand six hundred sixty-three (1,663) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cebu, at its session to be held at the Palace of Justice, City of Cebu, Philippines, on the 27th day of August, 1975, at 8.30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Juan Y. Reyes, Judge Branch I of said Court, the 2nd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF
ILOCOS SUR

Land Registration Case No. N-463
LRC Record No. N-46883

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. I-3, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Felisa Acas and Maria Flete or Plete, Vigan, Ilocos Sur; the Heirs of Mariano Alagar c/o Atty. Adolfo A. Alagar and Estelita Catriz, Poblacion, Vigan, Ilocos Sur; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Asterio Catriz, Poblacion, Vigan, Ilocos Sur; to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1791, Cad. 313-D, Vigan Cadastre, plan Ap-1-00092), with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Vigan, Province of Ilocos Sur. Bounded on the NE., by properties of Felisa Acas and Maria Flete or Plete; on the SE. and SW., by property of the Heirs of Mariano Alagar; and on the NW., by Florentino Street. Point "1" is S. 04 deg. 46 min. E., 89.83 meters from BLLM No. 1, Cad. 313-D, Vigan Cadastre. Area five hundred fifty-six (556) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Ilocos Sur, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Vigan, Province of Ilocos Sur, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 9:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your

default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Zoilo Aguinaldo, Judge of said Court, the 3rd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF ISABELA

Land Registration Case No. N-49-V
LRC Record No. N-46917

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. II-2, Ilagan, Isabela; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Santiago, Isabela; Fermin Velasco, Calaoan, Santiago, Isabela; the Heirs of Buenaventura Legaspi % Aurelio Legaspi, Baluarte, Santiago, Isabela; the Heirs of Juan Abulencia % Demetrio Abulencia and Patricia Legaspi, Rosario, Santiago, Isabela; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Aurelio Legaspi, Baluarte, Santiago, Isabela, thru Atty. Venancio B. Fernando, Santiago Isabela; to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 794, Santiago Cadastre, plan Ap-2-02-000072), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Nabuan (Baluarte) Municipality of Santiago, Province of Isabela. Bounded on the NE. and NW. by the Gananan River; on the E., by Lot 796; on the SE., by Lots 796, 795 and 793; and on the SW., by Lots 793 and 5520 all of Santiago Cadastre. Point "1" is N. 27 deg. 16 min. W., 653.04 meters from BLIM 80, Santiago Cadastre. Area twenty-four thousand four hundred seven (24,407) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Isabela, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Echague, Province of

Isabela, Philippines, on the 5th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ricardo D. Galano, Judge of said Court, the 3rd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LA UNION

Land Registration Case No. N-1512
LRC Record No. N-46869

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. I-1, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Juliana Ducusin, Natalia Balicha, Andres Milanes, Estrella or Estella Valero and Mariano Guerra, San Fernando, La Union; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Juanita Borja Gierra, San Fernando, La Union, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-244020) situated in the Barrio of Sevilla, Municipality of San Fernando, Province of La Union. Bounded on the N., by property of Juliana Ducusin; on the E., by property of Natalia Balicha; on the S., by property of Andres Milanes; and on the W., by property of Estrella or Estella Valero. Point "1" is S. 6 deg. 41 min. E., 858.57 meters from BLIM 1, San Fernando, La Union. Area four hundred fifty (450) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of La Union, at its session to be held in the Municipality of San Fernando, Province of La Union, Philippines, on the 19th day

of September 1975, at 8:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Angel A. Daquigan, Judge of said Court, the 25th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF MASBATE

Land Registration Case No. N-185
LRC Record No. N-46836

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Officer No. V-4, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Francisco Katigbak, Serafin Rosero, Carlos Borromeo, Masbate, Masbate; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Dominga O. Vda. de Vargas, Medina St., Masbate, Masbate thru Atty. Eduardo M. Marcaida, Jr., Masbate, Masbate to register and confirm her title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Masbate, Province of Masbate. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-252351). Bounded on the NE. by Provincial Government Land; on the SE. by Lot 2; on the SW. by Medina Street; and on the NW. by property of Francisco Katigbak. Point "1" is N. 80 deg. 43 min. E., 512.29 meters from BLLM 1, Masbate, Masbate. Area seven hundred eighty eight (788) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-252351). Bounded on the NE. by Provincial Government

Land; on the SE. by property of Serafin Rosero; on the SW. by Medina Street; and on the NW. by Lot 1. Point "1" is N. 80 deg. 43 min. E., 512.29 meters from BLLM 1, Masbate, Masbate. Area three hundred ninety-five (395) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Masbate, to be held at Branch III, Municipality of Masbate, Province of Masbate, Philippines, on the 7th day of July, 1975, at 9:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the application will be taken as confessed, and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Isabelo D. Kaindoy, Judge of said Court, the 7th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of May, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
OCCIDENTAL

Land Registration Case No. N-17
LRC Record No. N-47014

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VI-3 and Florinda G. Alunan, Bacolod City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Administrator, Agustin Gatuslao Estate, Jose M. Gatuslao and Ana Mercedes Silos, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental; and Florinda D. Vda. de Gatuslao, Cambugnon, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Antonio Gatuslao, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-06-000095), situated in the Barrio of Cambugnon, Municipality of Himamaylan; Province of Negros Occidental. Bounded on the N. by Public Land (portion of river bed), claimed by F. G. Alunan; on the NE. by Lot 523-N (LRC) Psd-174021, Estate of Agustin M. Gatuslao; on the S. by Lot 2793, property of Jose M. Gatuslao; and on the SW. by Himamaylan River. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 58 min. E., 751.49 meters from BBM No. 17, Himamaylan Cadastre 82. Area two thousand six hundred thirty-nine (2,639) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Negros Occidental, at its session to be held at the People's Hall, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental, Philippines, on the 19th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ostervaldo Z. Emilia, Judge of said Court, the 5th day of May, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of May, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, Jr.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
OCCIDENTAL

Land Registration Case No. N-18
LRC Record No. N-47015

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VI-3, Jose Alunan, Jr. Bacolod City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Florinda D. Vda. de Gatuslao, Antonio Gatuslao, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental; Miguel M. Gatuslao, Serafin Gatuslao, the Estate of Agustin Gatuslao, Cambugnon, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental and to all it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Florinda G. Alunan, Bacolod City to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 2805, plan Psu-06-000096), situated in the Barrio of Cambugnon, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental. Bounded on the N. by a public land (river bed portion) claimed by Serafin Gatuslao; on the NE. by property of Florinda D. Vda. de Gatuslao; on the S. by a public land (river bed portion) claimed by Antonio Gatuslao; and on the SW. by Himamaylan River. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 58 min. E., 751.49 meters from BBM No. 17, Himamaylan Cad. 82. Area one thousand seven hundred seventy-six (1,776) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Negros Occidental, at its session to be held at the People's Hall, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental, Philippines, on the 19th of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ostervaldo Z. Emilia, Judge of said Court, the 29th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of May, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, Jr.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
OCCIDENTAL

Land Registration Case No. N-19
LRC Record No. N-47016

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City, the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VI-3, Oscar Bascon, Bacolod City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the

Administrator, Estate of Agustin Gatuslao, Florenda Vda. de Gatuslao, Miguel M. Gatuslao, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Carminia G. Bascon, Bacolod City, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-06-000097), situated in the Barrio of Cambugnon, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental. Bounded on the N. and S. by Public Land (River Bed); on the NE. by the Estate of Agustin Gatuslao; and on the SW. by the Himamaylan River. Point "1" is N. 2 deg. 38 min. W., 1,026.29 meters from BBM 17, Himamaylan Cadastre 82. Area three thousand fifty-six (3,056) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Negros Occidental, at its session to be held at the Peoples Hall, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental, Philippines, on the 19th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ostervaldo Z. Emilia, Judge of said Court, the 5th day of May, in the year 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
 By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
 [20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
 COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
 OCCIDENTAL

Land Registration Case No. N-20
 LRC Record No. N-47017

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VI-3, Bacolod City; the Municipal

Mayor, the Municipal Council, Carminia G. Bascon, Florinda G. Alunan, the Administrator, Agustin Gatuslao Estate, Miguel M. Gatuslao and Esperanza Uy, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental; and Florinda D. Vda. de Gatuslao, Cambugnon, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Serafin Gatuslao, Himamaylan, Negros Occidental, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-06-000094), situated in the Barrio of Cambugnon, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental. Bounded on the N., by a public land (portion of River Bed) claimed by C. G. Bascon; on the NE., by Lot 523-A (LRC) Psd-174021 property of Miguel M. Gatuslao; on the S., by public land portion of River Bed) claimed by F. G. Alunan; and on the SW., by the Himamaylan River. Point "1" is N. 1 deg. 12 min. W., 916.83 meters from BBM 17, Himamaylan Cadastre 82. Area one thousand four hundred fifty-eight (1,458) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Negros Occidental, at its session to be held at People's Hall, Municipality of Himamaylan, Province of Negros Occidental, Philippines, on the 19th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ostervaldo Z. Emilia, Judge of said Court, the 5th day of May, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of May, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
 By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
 [20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
 COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA
 Land Registration Case No. N-1-G.
 LRC Record No. N-46926

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the

Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Guagua, Pampanga; Martin Gonzales, Felipe Romero, the Heirs of Diego Limson Sto. Cristo, Guagua, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the spouses David J. Jingco Sr. and Virginia C. Jingco, Guagua, Pampanga, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 4867 Cad. 376-D Guagua Cadastre plan As-03-000145), with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Sto. Cristo, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the NE., by property of Felipe Romero; on the SE., by Provincial Road; on the SW., by property of Martin Gonzales; and on the NW., by Lot 7,103 no claimant. Point "1" is S. 0 deg. 51 min. W., 159.17 meters from BLLM 1, Guagua Cad-376-D. Area one hundred seventeen (117) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at Gusali ng Katarungan, Cervantes Subdivision, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on 12th day of September, 1975, at 9:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Presiding Judge, Branch II of said Court, the 10th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 5th day of May, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.

Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA

Land Registration Case No. N-2-G

LRC Record No. N-46927

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the

Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Guagua Pampanga; the Heirs of Roberto or Ruperto Santos, Juan Almario, Heirs of Wenceslao Almario, the Heirs of Cesareo delos Santos, Sto. Niño, Guagua, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Spouses David C. Jingco, Jr. and Julieta S. Jingco, Sto. Niño, Guagua, Pampanga; to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 4518, Cad. 376-D, Guagua Cadastre plan As-03-000146), situated in the Barrio of Sto. Niño, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the NE., by property of the Heirs of Roberto or Ruperto Santos; on the SE., by property of Juan Almario; on the SW., by property of the Heirs of Wenceslao Almario; and on the NW., by the Provincial Road. Point "1" is S. 2 deg. 33 min. W., 182.35 meters from BLLM 1, Guagua Cad-376-D. Area two hundred (200) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at the Branch II, Gusali ng Katarungan, Cervantes Subdivision, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on the 10th day of September, 1975, at 9:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Presiding Judge of said Court the 10th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.

Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

[20, 21]

Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8241

LRC Record No. N-44215

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the

District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila, Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway district Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, and the Municipal Council, Joaquin Vitor, Binangonan, Rizal; Perfecto San Gabriel, Tayuman, Binangonan, Rizal; Sabina Aguinaldo, Angono, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Spouses Jaime Lopez, Jr. and Editha L. Lopez, Calumpang, Binangonan, Rizal, thru Atty. Mariano H. G. Cervo, Binangonan, Rizal; to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-185473) with the improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Tayuman, Municipality of Binangonan, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the NE. by property of Perfecto San Gabriel; on the SE. by property of Sabina Aguinaldo; on the SW. by the Laguna Bay; and on the NW. by property of Joaquin Vitor. Point "1" is S. 44 deg. 53 min. E., 2,652.90 meters from BLLM 2, Angono, Rizal. Area ten thousand five hundred thirty four (10,534) square meters more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 20th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Pedro C. Navarro, Judge of said Court, the 28th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 29th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[20.21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8597
LRC Record No. N-46275

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Manager, Manila Railroad Company, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, and the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Belen Sumulong, the Heirs of Vicente Leyva, the Heirs of Lino Bagtas, or Sargas, Jose Cojuangco Sr., Antipolo, Rizal; Lumen Sumulong, 146 Tuberias, San Juan del Monte, Rizal; Belen Sumulong, 11 Palm Avenue, Forbes Park, Makati, Rizal; Lorenzo Sumulong, 577-B.M. Earnshaw, Manila; Paz Sumulong 83 Apo, Quezon City; Esperanza Payawal, Juan Sumulong III and Mario Sumulong, 295 M. Domingo, San Juan, del Monte Rizal; Maria Luisa Sumulong, 18, 12th Street, Quezon City; and Francisco Sumulong, 300 M. Reyes San Juan del Monte, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Demetria Sumulong Cojuangco, Antipolo, Rizal; thru F. Sumulong and Associates Law Office, by Atty. Francisco Sumulong, R-615 AIU Bldg., Ayala Avenue, Makati Rizal, to register and confirm her title to the following properties:

THREE (3) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of Ibayo and Poblacion, Municipality of Antipolo, Province of Rizal. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows;

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1 plan-Psu-199392) Bounded on the NE., by property of Manila Railroad Company; on the E., by Manuel L. Quezon Street; on the SE., by property of Demetria Sumulong and on the SW., by property of Belen Sumulong; Point "1" is N. 3 deg. 44 min. W., 608.86 meters from BLLM 1, Antipolo, Rizal. Area five hundred two (502) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan-Psu-199392). Bounded on the N., by property of Manila Railroad Company; on the E., by property of Heirs of Vicente Leyva; on the SE., by Cayetano; Arel-

lano on the SW., by property of Demetrio Sumulong and M.L. Quezon Street and on the W., by the M.L. Quezon Street. Point "1" is N. 0 deg. 30 min. W, 623.04 meters from BLLM 1, Antipolo, Rizal. Area one thousand two hundred twenty one (1,221) square meters more or less.

3. A parcel of land (Lot 3, plan-Psu-199392). Bounded on the N., by property of the Heirs of Lino Bagtas or Sagtas; on the E., by a Barrio Road; and on the W., by property of Demetria Sumulong; Point "1" is N. 6 deg. 04 min. E 835.18 meters from BLLM 1, Antipolo, Rizal. Area six hundred sixty three (663) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 11th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid your default will be recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ricardo I. Pronove, Jr., Judge of said Court, the 2nd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8790
LRC Record No. N-46933

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano Street, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, and the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Cornelio

Espiritu and Sabina Espiritu, Taguig, Rizal; Ricardo Domingo, Basilio Lopez B. Mojica, Jose E. Avila, Bernardino Elias, Epifanio Bernardino, Eliseo Castro and Graciano Domingo, Hagonoy, Taguig, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the spouses Serafin C. Salvador and Tesalonica S. Salvador, Tambak, Hagonoy, Taguig, Rizal, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of Hagonoy, Municipality of Taguig, Province of Rizal. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (plan Psu-252385). Bounded on the NE., by an alley; on the SE., by property of Sabina Espiritu; on the SW. by a creek; and on the NW., by property of Cornelio Espiritu. Point "1" is S. 71 deg. 19 min. E., 7,094.05 meters from BLBM 1, Maricaban, Parañaque, Rizal. Area two hundred twenty three (223) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-2263116). Bounded on the NE., by property of Jose E. Avila, et al; on the E., by Lot 3 property of Basilio Lopez B. Mojica; on the S., by property of Bernardino Elias; and on the W., by Lot 1 property of Ricardo Domingo. Point "1" is S. 8 deg. 01 min. W., 850.14 meters from BLLM No. 1, Taguig, Rizal. Area two hundred ten (210) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 24th day of July, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Pedro C. Navarro, Judge of said Court, the 18th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[20, 21] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8793
LRC Record No. N-46934

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano Street, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, the Municipal Mayor, and the Municipal Council, Pasig, Rizal; the Heirs of Pablo Velasco and Lope de Silva, Pinagbuhatan, Pasig, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Teofista San Juan Vda. de Raymundo, Kapasigan, Pasig, Rizal, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-232654), situated in the Sitio of Magpayong, Barrio of Pinagbuhatan, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the NE., by property of Lope de Silva; on the SE., and SW. by property of Teofista San Juan Vda. de Raymundo; and on the NW. by property of the Heirs of Pablo Velasco. Point "1" is S. 60 deg. 10 min. E., 3,292.00 meters from BLLM 1, Pasig, Rizal. Area two thousand five hundred fifty two (2,552) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Hall of Justice, Provincial Capitol Compound, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 25th day of July, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Emilio V. Salas, Presiding Judge, Branch I, of said Court, the 18th day of April, in the year 1975.

084766—8

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, Jr.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8506
LRC Record No. N-45975

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Enrique Manalo, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Celerina de la Cruz, and Benjamin Mendoza, Tanay, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Heirs of Leocadio McDonough, namely Alicia McDonough, Edgardo McDonough, Norberto McDonough, Ernesto McDonough, Armando McDonough, Norma McDonough, and Lolita McDonough, 59 M. H. del Pilar St., Pasig, Rizal, thru Atty. Leonardo C. Rodriguez, 54 M. H. Almeda St., Pateros, Rizal, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-186830), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Panusugin, Municipality of Tanay, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the NE. by property of Celerina de la Cruz; on the E. by Panusugin River; on the SW. by property of Enrique Manalo and Lot 2; and on the W. and NW. by Public Land. Point "1" is N. 39 deg. 07 min. E., 7,312.67 meters from BLLM 1, Tanay, Rizal. Area fifty one thousand five hundred twenty (51,520) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 4th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your de-

fault will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Gregorio G. Pineda, Judge of said Court, the 21st day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:
 GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
 Commissioner of Land Registration
 By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
 Acting Chief, Docket Division
 [20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
 COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8773
 LRC Record No. N-47018

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Ireneo Lozada, and Placido Guevarra, Las Piñas, Rizal; Herminia Bantog, Tabon, Las Piñas, Rizal; Vicente Guevarra and Pilar Guevara, San Jose St., Manuyo, Las Piñas, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Andres Guevarra, Tabon, Las Piñas, Rizal, thru Atty. Elum C. Banda, 74 N. Ramirez St., Quezon City, to register and confirm his title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Tabon, Municipality of Las Piñas, Province of Rizal. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-172508). Bounded on the NE. by property of Ireneo Lozada; on the SE. by the San Jose Street; on the SW. by property of Placido Guevarra; and on the NW. by Lot 2. Point "1" is N. 27 deg. 03 min. E., 230.51 meters from BLLM 4, Las Piñas, Rizal. Area forty (40) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-172508). Bounded on the NE. by property of Ireneo Lozada;

on the SE. by Lot 1; on the SW. by property of Placido Guevarra; and on the NW. by property of the Municipal Government of Las Piñas. Point "1" is N. 17 deg. 50 min. E., 240.81 meters from BLLM 4, Las Piñas Rizal. Area five hundred fourteen (514) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 8th day of August, 1975, at 8:15 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Buenaventura J. Guerrero, Judge of said Court, the 6th day of May, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 15th day of May, 1975.

Attest:
 GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
 Commissioner of Land Registration
 By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
 Acting Chief, Docket Division
 [20, 21]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
 COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF
 EASTERN SAMAR

Land Registration Case No. N-15
 LRC Record No. N-45783

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the 3rd Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VIII-5, Borongan, Eastern Samar; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Concordia D. Soco, Segundo Salazar, Meliton Delantar, Antonio Amarille and Albino M. Duran, Balangiga, Eastern Samar; Isidro Daras, Lorenzo Calesterio, Concordio D. Boco, Jose Catalgo, Lorenzo Salazar, Fernando Cotin, Sergio Delantar and Francisco Dado, Lonang, Balangiga, Eastern Samar; Juan Nabong, 3rd Highway Engineering District, Borongan, Eastern Samar; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Elisa E. Ellema, Balangiga, Eastern Samar, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-08-000006), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Balangiga, Province of Eastern Samar. Bounded on the N., by the National Road; NE., by Duran 11 (Municipal Passage Way) and beyond by property of Antonio Amarille; S., by property of Concordia D. Soco and on the SW., by Duran 1 (Municipal Passage Way) and beyond by property of Segundo Salazar and on the NW., property of Meliton Deiantar. Point "1" is S. 53 deg. 13 min. E., 213.68 meters from BLLM 1, Balangiga, Eastern Samar. Area five hundred sixty six (566) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Eastern Samar, at its

session to be held at the Session Hall, Municipality of Guinan, Province of Eastern Samar, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Wenceslao M. Polo, District Judge of said Court, the 13th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[20, 21]

Lungsod ng Batangas

(BATANGAS CITY)

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
BATANGAS CITY
OFFICE OF THE CITY MAYOR

ADVERTISEMENT

Sealed bids on the form to be furnished by the City Engineer will be received at the Office of the City Engineer, Batangas City until 10:00 A.M. on the 10th day of June, 1975, and then publicly opened for the Construction of Barrio Hall at Conde Labac, Batangas City.

Financing Requirement:

CASH	P700.00
CREDIT LINE	1,400.00

Submit at the Office of the City Engineer, Batangas City on or before the following deadline:

PRE C-1	May 30, 1975
PRE C-2	May 30, 1975

Full particulars may be obtained at the above-named office by any prospective bidder upon request

(Sgd.) MACARIO M. MENDOZA
City Mayor

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
BATANGAS CITY
OFFICE OF THE CITY MAYOR

ADVERTISEMENT

Scaled bids on the form to be furnished by the City Engineer will be received at the Office of the City Engineer, Batangas City until 10:00 A.M. on the 10th day of June, 1975, and then publicly opened for the Construction of Batangas East Elementary School Toilet (Formerly Batangas North Elem. School), Batangas City.

Financing Requirements:

CASH	P500.00
CREDIT LINE	1,000.00

Submit at the office of the City Engineer, Batangas City on or before the following deadline:

PRE C-1	May 30, 1975
PRE C-2	May 30, 1975

Full particulars may be obtained at the above-named office by any prospective bidder upon request

(Sgd.) MACARIO M. MENDOZA
City Mayor

Lupon ng Pamumuhunan
(BOARD OF INVESTMENTS)

[FIRST PUBLICATION]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, WILLIAM TO, a citizen of the Republic of China, with office address at 1323 Soler Street, Manila, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for a license to engage in the wholesale of general merchandise and hardware. The business is capitalized at P239,604.43, Philippine currency, and is actually a continuation of an existing business licensed under the name of his deceased father, To Siao.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the condition that he shall submit an annual report of his business activities (using the prescribed BOI Form No. 5032) on or before March 31 of each year.

April 29, 1975. Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION JR.
[20-22] Board Secretary

MGA PAHAYAG NA LEGAL AT OPISYAL

(LEGAL AND OFFICIAL NOTICES)

Hukumang Unang Dulugan

(COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)

[LAST PUBLICATION]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BATAAN
FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH II

CADASTRAL CASE No. 5, Cadastral Record No. 177, Lot No. 750, Balanga Cadastre.—Petition for the Reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title No. (Not Available).

VIRGINIA DE LOS REYES, Petitioner

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: The Director of Printing, Manila; Virginia de los Reyes, Balanga, Bataan; Vicente Sarno, Gertrudes Camacho, Norberto Reyes, Ramon Tuazon and Marcos Martinez, all of Balanga, Bataan; the Register of Deeds of Bataan, Balanga, Bataan and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been filed in this Court by Virginia de los Reyes thru counsel, under the provisions of Republic Act No. 26, for the reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title No. (N.A.), copy of said title was alleged to have been lost in the possession of the original owner during the last war and the original thereof was likewise lost and/or destroyed in the Office of the Register of Deeds of Bataan, Balanga, Bataan, also as a consequence of said war, covering a parcel of land known as Lot No. 750 of the Cadastral Survey of Balanga, located in the Municipality of Balanga, Bataan, bounded as follows:

- On the S. by a Road;
- On the W. by Lot 1885 and Lot 1884;
- On the N. by Lot 1884 and Lot 754; and
- On the E. by Lot 751.

Area: 267 square meters, more or less.

Wherefore, you are hereby given notice that said petition has been set for hearing on July 29, 1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the morning, in the Sala of this Court at the Provincial Capitol, Balanga, Bataan, at which date, time and place aforesaid, you should appear and file your objections, if any, to the said petition.

Let copy of this Notice be published twice in the *Official Gazette*.

Witness, the Honorable Pedro T. Santiago, Judge of this Court, this 21st day of April, 1975 at Balanga, Bataan.

MARVIN V. SORIANO
Deputy Clerk of Court

By:

(Sgd.) CAEZAR B. MALIXI
Special Deputy Clerk of Court

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAPIZ
ELEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH II

CADASTRAL CASE No. 10, LRC (GLRO) Cadastral Record No. 384, Lot No. 3764, Dao Cadastre.

TOMAS E. TABURA, Petitioner
MARIA ESPINOS (Registered Owner)

AMENDED NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Geomer C. Delfin, Panitan, Capiz, Roque Arcenas, Francisco Espinosa, Vicente Bevirol, Geronimo Clarito, Ponciano Esimos, Diego Catalan, Cipriano Barona, Maria Perocho, Rosal Espinosa, Dorotea Tabura, Juan Hipisan, Crespola Espina, Vicente Handog and Leon Roto, all of Maindang, Cuartero, Capiz, and to whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been filed with this Court under the provisions of Republic Act No. 26, by the herein petitioner, thru counsel, for the reconstitution of a lost Original Certificate of Title alleged to have been lost and/or destroyed on file in the Office of the Register of Deeds of Capiz, as well as its duplicate copy as a result of the last World War;

The said lot is bounded and described as follows:

"A parcel of land (Lot 3764 of the Cadastral Survey of Dao), situated in the Sitio of Balingasa, Barrio of Maindang, Municipality of Cuartero, Province of Capiz. Bounded on the W., and NW., along lines 1-2-3-4-5, by Lot 3758; on the E., NW., and SW., along lines 5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-14-15-16-17-18-19, by Lot 3751; on the NW., along line 19-20 by Lot 3756; on the NE., and NW., along lines 20-21-22, by Lot 3754; on the N., along lines 22-23-24, by Lot 3756; on the E., along lines 24-25-26, by Lot 3704; on the SW., SE., and NE., along lines 26-27-28-29-30-31, by Lot 3753; on the S., along line 31-32, by Lot 3706; along lines 32-33, by Lot 3752; along lines 33-34-35-36, by Lot 3765 and along line 36-37, by Lot 3766; on the S. and SW., along lines 37-38-39-40-41 by Lot 3763; on the N. along lines 41-42-43-44-45-46, by Lot 3760; and on the N. and W., along lines 46-47-48-1, by Lot 3759, all of Dao Cadastre. Containing an area of ninety-nine thousand eight hundred thirty-eight (99,838) square meters, more or less."

Therefore, you are hereby given notice that the said petition has been set for hearing on the 12th

day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the morning in the session hall of this Court, Branch II, Capiz Provincial Capitol in Roxas City, in which date, time and place you should appear and file your objections or claims if you have any to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Pelayo V. Nuevo, Judge of this Court, this 5th day of April, 1975.

(Sgd.) ANDRES E. DONATO, JR.

[19, 20] Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAPIZ
ELEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH I

CADASTRAL CASE No. 28, GLRO Cadastral Record No. 957, Lot No. 1148, Ivisan Cadastre.

BERNARDINO VILLAR, Petitioner

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Rene Blanco Honrado, Roxas City, Julian Villar, Eulalia Alensuela, Nicolas Vahon, Celedonia Galindo, Maxima Alensuela, Leopoldo Alensuela and The Municipal Mayor all of Ivisan, Capiz, District Land Officer and Provincial Engineer, both of Roxas City, and to whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been filed with this Court under the provisions of Republic Act No. 26, by Atty. Rene B. Honrado, counsel for the herein petitioner for the reconstitution of a lost Original Certificate of Title alleged to have lost or destroyed on file in the Office of the Register of Deeds for the Province of Capiz, as well as its duplicate copy as a result of the last world war:

"A parcel of land (Lot 1148 of the cadastral survey of Ivisan), situated in the barrio of Basiao, municipality of Ivisan, province of Capiz. Bounded on the NW., along lines 1-2-3-4 by Lot 1146; on the NE., along line 4-5 by Lot 1158; along lines 5-6-7-8- by Lot 1153; along line 8-9 by lot 1152; on the E., along lines 9-10-11 by Lot 1150; along lines 11-12-13 by Lot 1149; on the S., & SW., along lines 13-14-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22-23-24-25-26 - 27 - 28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35 by Inalan Creek; on the W., along lines 35-36-37-38-39-40-41 42 by Cabugao Bay; and on the NW., along line 42-1 by Lot 1146, all of Ivisan Cadastre, containing an area of three hundred thirty-five thousand nine hundred thirty-two (335,932) square meters, more or less."

Therefore, you are hereby given notice that the said petition has been set for hearing on the 19th day of September, 1975, at 8:00 o'clock in the morning in the session hall of this Court, at the Provincial Capitol in Roxas City in which date, time and place you should appear and file your objections or claims if you have any to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Pelayo V. Nuevo, Judge of this court this 10th day of April, 1975.

(Sgd.) ANDRES E. DONATO, JR.

[19, 20] Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE
SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
CAVITE CITY

LRC RECORD No. 8843—Petition for Judicial Reconstitution of Title No. 18555

PABLO SILIA, ET ALS., Petitioner

NOTICE OF HEARING

There is a petition filed by petitioners, alleging among things, that they are the only legal heirs of Teodora Saulog, the registered owner of a parcel of land known as Cadastral Lot No. 1392, situated at Alapan 1st., Imus, Cavite; that the owners copy of said title was lost while its original copy was burned on June 7, 1959; that the land is not affected by any lien or encumbrances; and praying that the Registered of Deeds for the Province of Cavite be ordered to reconstitute the title to the said lot.

Notice is hereby given that the said petition has been set for hearing on July 15, 1975, at 9:00 a.m., in this Court, Branch V, Bacoor, Cavite, on which date, hour and place, any person interested was cited to appear and show cause why the said petition should not be granted.

Let this Notice be published twice in the *Official Gazette*.

Bacoor, Cavite, April 29, 1975.

(Sgd.) ROLANDO D. DIAZ

[19, 20] Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE
SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH V
BACOR, CAVITE

LRC RECORD No. 8843—Petition for Judicial Reconstitution of Title No. 4216

NORMA CALUBAYAN PARNALA, Petitioner.

NOTICE OF HEARING

There is a petition filed by petitioner, alleging among things, that she is the only legal heirs of the late Luis Calubayan, the registered owner of a parcel of land known as Cadastral Lot No. 1403, situated at Alapan 1st., Imus, Cavite; that the owners copy of said title was lost while its original copy was burned on June 7, 1959; that the land is not affected by any lien or encumbrances; and praying that the Register of Deeds for the Province of Cavite be ordered to reconstitute the title to the said lot,

Notice is hereby given that the said petition has been set for hearing on July 15, 1975, at 9:00 a.m., in this Court, Branch V, Bacoar, Cavite, on which date, hour and place, any person interested was cited to appear and show cause why the said petition should not be granted.

Let this Notice be published twice in the *Official Gazette*.

Bacoar, Cavite, April 29, 1975.

[19.20] (Sgd.) ROLANDO D. DIAZ
Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU
FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH XVI, LAPU-LAPU CITY

CADASTRAL CASE No. 22, LRC RECORD No. 1018,
Lot No. 5807, Opon Cadastre

THE DIRECTOR OF LANDS, Petitioner, *vs.* FLORENCIA
ABADIA, ET AL., Claimants
TIRSO DAÑO, Movant

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Florito F. V. Mangubat, Lapu-Lapu City; Tirso Daño, Centro, Tungasan, Lapu-Lapu City; The Register of Deeds, Lapu-Lapu City; Juana Tisoy, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City; Pablo Maranga, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City; Pantaleon Bahag, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City; Fortunato Mata, Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City.

GREETINGS:

Please take notice that the petition filed with this Court by Tirso Daño, thru counsel Atty. Florito F. V. Mangubat, seeking for the reconstitution of the Original Certificate of Title of Lot No. 5807, Opon Cadastre, is set for hearing on June 27, 1975 at 9:00 o'clock in the morning before the 16th Branch of this Court located at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

Lot No. 5807 is situated at barrio Sta. Rosa, Lapu-Lapu City and bounded by the properties of the last 4 aforementioned persons.

You are therefore ordered to appear at the date, time and place of hearing herein designated and to show cause if there is any you have why said petition should not be granted.

Witness, the Honorable Ramon E. Nazareno, Presiding Judge of this Court, this 4th day of April, 1975 at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

[19,20] (Sgd.) PATERNO M. ROSAL
Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU
FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH XVI, LAPU-LAPU CITY

CADASTRAL CASE No. 17, LRC REC. No. 946, Lot
No. 1258, Opon Cadastre

THE DIRECTOR OF LANDS, Petitioner, *vs.* ENEMESIA
ACASO, ET AL., Claimants.

JOSE R. YBAÑEZ, Movant.

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Florito F. V. Mangubat, Lapu-Lapu City; Jose R. Ybañez, Banawa, Cebu City; The Register of Deeds, Lapu-Lapu City; Ana-cleta Lubas, Babag, Lapu-Lapu City; Juan Ibales, Babag, Lapu-Lapu City;; Wenceslao Pungasi, Lapu-Lapu City; Mauricio Augusto, Lapu-Lapu City; Juliana Pungasi, Lapu-Lapu City.

GREETINGS:

Please take notice that the petition filed with this Court by Jose R. Ybañez, thru counsel Atty. Florito F. V. Mangubat, seeking for the reconstitution of the Original Certificate of Title of Lot No. 1258, Opon Cadastre, is set for hearing on June 27, 1975 at 9:00 o'clock in the morning before the 16th Branch of this Court located at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

Lot No. 1258 is situated at barrio Babag, Lapu-Lapu City and bounded by the properties of the last 5 aforementioned persons.

You are therefore ordered to appear at the date, time and place of hearing herein designated and to show cause if there is any you have why said petition should not be granted.

Witness, the Honorable Ramon E. Nazareno, Presiding Judge of this Court, this 4th day of April, 1975 at Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines.

[19,20] (Sgd.) PATERNO M. ROSAL
Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF MISAMIS
ORIENTAL

FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH I
CAGAYAN DE ORO CITY

IN RE: PETITION for Readjudication of original
Certificate of Title No. (N.A.)

EDELMIRA JO SANTOS, Petitioner

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: The Honorable Solicitor General-Dept. of Justice, Manila; The District Land Officer-Bureau of Lands, Cagayan de Oro City; Mr. Rustico Ebarrat, Iponan, Cagayan de Oro City; Mr. E. Sorina, Iponan, Cagayan de Oro City; Mr. Julian Donque, Barra Iponan, Opol, Misamis Oriental.

GREETINGS:

Whereas, a petition for reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title alleged to have been lost and/or destroyed, under Republic Act 26 has been filed by petitioner thru counsel in the above-entitled case, covering Lot No. 6500, under Decree No. 738190, bounded and described as follows:

"A parcel of land located at Iponan, Cagayan de Oro City, bounded on the NE. by Lots Nos. 6499 and 6501; and on the S., SW. and NW. by Lot No. 6498, containing an area of two thousand three hundred and fifty-six (2,356) square meters more or less."

Wherefore, notice is hereby given that said petition is set for hearing before this Court in the City of Cagayan de Oro, on the 12th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 A.M., in which time and place you should appear and show cause if any you have, why the petition should not be granted.

Witness, the Honorable Benjamin K. Gorospe, Judge of this Court, this 3rd day of March, 1975.

For and in the absence of:

CHARITO A. AKUT
Clerk of Court

By:

(Sgd.) CRISANTO MUTIA, JR.
[19, 20] Special Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF MISAMIS
ORIENTAL
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH I
CAGAYAN DE ORO CITY

IN RE: PETITION for Reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title No. (N.A.), Lot No. 6072 Cagayan Cadastre.

EDELMIRA Jo SANTOS, Petitioner

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: The Honorable Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Manila; The District Land Officer, Bureau of Lands, Cagayan de Oro City; Atty. Anthony Santos, Cagayan de Oro City.

GREETINGS:

Whereas, a petition for reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title alleged to have been lost and/or destroyed, under Republic Act 26 has been filed by petitioner thru counsel in the above-entitled case, covering Lot No. 6072, under Decree No. 729264, bounded and described as follows:

"A parcel of land located at Bulua, Cagayan de Oro City, bounded on the NE. by Lot No. 6069; on the E. by Lots Nos. 6073 and 6074; on the SW. by Lot No. 6075; and on the NW. by Lots Nos. 6071 and 6070, containing an area of four thousand seven hundred and thirty (4,730) square meters more or less."

Wherefore, notice is hereby given that said petition is set for hearing before this Court, in the City of Cagayan de Oro, on the 12th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 A.M., in which time and place you should appear and show cause if any you have, why the petition should not be granted.

Witness, the Honorable Benjamin K. Gorospe, Judge of this Court, this 3rd day of March, 1975.

For and in the absence of:

CHARITO A. AKUT
Clerk of Court

By:

(Sgd.) CRISANTO MUTIA, JR.
[19, 20] Special Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
OCCIDENTAL
TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH IV

CADASTRAL CASE No. 11, LRC (GLRO) Record No. 100, Lot No. 362 Isabela Cadastre
MA. MELLIZA MILLAN, Petitioner
NOTICE

To: Gavino Millan, Salvador Tabuga and Jesus Miranda, all of Isabela, Negros Occidental and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been filed before this Court by petitioner, under Republic Act No. 26, for the reconstitution of Transfer Certificate of Title No. 5200 covering Lot No. 362 of Isabela Cadastre, in the name of Zoila Aguilar, which parcel of land is bounded on the NE., by Lot No. 363; on the SE., by Lot No. 1352; on the SW., by Lot No. 360 and on the NW., by Lot No. 359, with an area of 17,357 square meters, more or less.

Therefore, notice is hereby given that said petition has been set for hearing before this Court (Br. IV), on July 11, 1975, at 2:00 P.M., at the Provincial Capitol of this province, Bacolod City, on which date, time and place, all persons interested in the said lot may appear and state their reasons, if any they have, to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Ernesto S. Tengco, Judge of this Court, this 24th day of February, 1975.

(Sgd.) ANTONIO G. PURA
[19, 20] Branch Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
OCCIDENTAL
TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH I, SILAY CITY

CADASTRAL CASE No. 29, GLRO CADASTRAL RECORD No. 292, Lot No. 560, Escalante Cadastre.

EMILIANA BRINQUIS, Petitioner
NOTICE

To: Emiliana Brinquis, Escalante, Negros Occidental; Engracia Vda. de Lasadas, Rizal, Es-

calante, Negros Occidental; Fabian Bardoquilio, Buenavista, Escalante, Negros Occidental; Epifanio Pabuaya, Sitio Bajabaja, Buenavista, Escalante, Negros Occidental; Pedro Pabuaya, Rizal, Escalante, Negros Occidental; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition had been filed by the petitioner, Emiliana Brinquis, praying for the reconstitution of Original Certificate of Title No. (N.A.), covering Lot No. 560 of Escalante Cadastre. Said Lot is described as follows:

"A parcel of land (Lot No. 560 of the Cadastral Survey of Escalante), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Municipality of Escalante. Bounded on the NE. by Lot No. 545; on the SE. by Lot 561; on the SW. by Lots Nos. 562 and 559; and on the NW. by Lot No. 557. Containing an area of 4,574 square meters, more or less."

Wherefore, you are hereby given notice that the said petition has been set for hearing on June 13, 1975, at 8:30 A.M. before this Court, Branch I, Silay City, at which time, date and place, you may appear and file your objections or claims if you have any to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Rafael C. Climaco, Judge of this Court, this 16th day of April, 1975.

(Sgd.) JUANITO R. DE JOSE
[19,20] Special Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NEGROS
OCCIDENTAL
TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BRANCH X, SILAY CITY

CADASTRAL CASE No. 30, GLRO CADASTRAL RECORD
No. 303, Lot No. 1938, Escalante Cadastre.—For
Reconstitution of Title.

TRANQUILINO DUMDUM, JR., Petitioner
NOTICE

To: Tranquilino Dumdum, Jr., San Carlos City; Antonio Dumdum, San Carlos City; Betty Dumdum, San Carlos City; Pedrin Dumdum, San Carlos City; Rubin Dumdum, San Carlos City; and the Register of Deeds of Negros Occidental; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been filed by the petitioner, Tranquilino Dumdum, Jr., praying for the reconstitution of the original and duplicate Certificate of Title No. (N.A.) covering Lot No. 1938 of Escalante Cadastre, as well as the owner's duplicate registered in the name of Leoncia Dumdum, alleging that said lot is described as follows:

"A parcel of land (Lot No. 1938 of the Cadastral Survey of Escalante). Bounded on the N. by 1936 Cad. No. 128; on the E. by Lot 1939 Cad. 128; on the S. by Municipal Road; on the W. by Lot 1936 & 1937 all of Cad. 128, Escalante, Negros Occidental. Contain-

ing an area of one thousand eight hundred and ninety three (1,893) square meters, more or less."

Therefore, you are hereby given notice that the said petition has been set for hearing on Friday, June 27, 1975, at 8:30 in the morning, before this Court, Branch X, Silay City, at which time, date and place you may appear and file your objections and claims if you have any to the petition.

Witness, the Honorable Rafael C. Climaco, Judge of this Court, this 25th day of March, 1975.

(Sgd.) JUANITO R. DE JOSE
[19,20] Special Deputy Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA
FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
THIRD BRANCH

SPECIAL PROCEEDING No. 2427—In the Matter of the Petition of EUFRICINA DE PEDRO to Declare her husband ALFREDO LACSAMANA Presumptively Dead and for Appointment as Administratrix.

EUFRICINA DE PEDRO, Petitioner

ORDER

This is a verified petition sufficient in form and substance filed by Euficina de Pedro alleging that she is the lawful wedded wife of one Alfredo Lacsamana; that after her marriage with her husband, they stayed at San Jose, San Fernando, Pampanga; that her said husband has been absent for ten (10) years now since he stepped down from their conjugal dwelling at San Fernando, Pampanga to visit his friends; that her husband never returned since then up to the present time and that his absence was reported to the authorities and made known to relatives and friends, that during the entire period of absence of her husband, she nor her relatives and friends as well as the authorities have not seen even once her absent husband; neither did they receive any communication or news of petitioner's husband as being alive; that during her marriage with her husband, they have acquired properties with an approximate value of six thousand (P6,000.00) pesos; that they have no known debts and that she desires to dispose and/or do some acts of administration over the above referred properties without incurring any legal difficulty by virtue of the facts and that lawful administrator Alfredo Lacsamana has been absent for the last 10 years now and there has been no sign that he still lives and his whereabouts unknown.

The petitioner prays that after due notice and hearing, an order issue declaring her absent husband presumptively dead and to appoint her as administratrix of the property left by her husband.

Giving due course to the petition, the same was set for hearing and the corresponding notice therefor (Exhibit A) was duly published in a newspaper

of general circulation in the province of Pampanga and Angeles City for three (3) consecutive weeks (Exhibits A-1, B, B-1, C, C-1, D and D-1).

At the hearing as set, the petition was caused to be announced twice in open court. No opposition was thereto interposed by any person except the Government represented by the office of the Provincial Fiscal of Pampanga. The petitioner thereupon moved that the presentation of the evidence be delegated to a commissioner, which motion was duly granted. Subsequently, the hearing of the petition proceeded before the commissioner thus appointed.

The evidence presented by the petitioner reveals that she is legally married to one Alfredo Laxamana on October 19, 1964; that after their marriage, they stayed at San Jose, San Fernando, Pampanga; that she begot no issue out of her union with her husband; that in the latter part of 1965, her husband left their conjugal home to visit some friends, but that since then her said husband has failed to return even up to the present time; that she reported her husband's disappearance to the authorities as well as to their relatives and friends, but no news of his whereabouts was ever relayed to her; that she has never heard nor received communication of her husband since the time the latter disappeared and that no sign of his status as being alive could ever be found; that during her marriage with her husband, they acquired property consisting of furnitures amounting to P6,000.00; that her husband was a farmer by occupation; that she desires to dispose of and/or do some acts of administration over the property left by her husband without incurring any legal difficulty relative thereto.

The foregoing evidence presented by the petitioner remain the sole and uncontroverted evidence on record. The representation for the Government chose not to adduce evidence in support of its opposition. The court, therefore, guided by the only evidence on hand, shall consider this case on the basis of the said evidence.

From an evaluation of the evidence herein obtaining, the Court believes and so holds that the same evidence, considered together, will uphold the position of the petitioner to obtain relief by a declaration of her absent husband presumptively dead and for her to be appointed as administratrix of the property left by her said husband. Indeed, a person unheard from for 7 years is presumed dead for all purposes, except for those of succession (Art. 390, New Civil Code). However, presumption of death cannot be the only issue or subject in an action or proceeding, because it is the law itself which decrees the presumption. The action or proceeding, therefore, in order to prosper, must be coupled with another subject which is the administration of the property left by the absent person. In the case at bar, this requirement, the Court believes, has been amply complied with.

Wherefore, in view of all the foregoing considerations an order is hereby issued declaring one Alfredo Laxamana an absentee and the petitioner is hereby appointed administratrix of the property left by the said absentee. Let this judicial pronouncement of absence be published once in a newspaper of general circulation in the province of Pampanga and once in the *Official Gazette*.

So ORDERED.

San Fernando, Pampanga, April 26, 1975.

(Sgd.) MARIANO CASTAÑEDA, JR.
Judge

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF SURIGAO
DEL NORTE

FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
SURIGAO CITY
BRANCH I

CADASTRAL CASE No. 16, GLRO Record No. 1367,
Lot No. 1440, Surigao Cadastre

THE DIRECTOR OF LANDS, Petitioner, *vs.* SEVERO FEROL, ET AL. (Respondents)

ELISEO MATURAN & FELIX MATURAN, Movants

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: Atty. Olimpio R. Epis, counsel of the movants; Messrs. Eliseo Maturan and Felix Maturan, movants in the above-entitled case; the City Mayor, the City Engineer, the City Fiscal, the Provincial Land Officer, Mr. Delfin Rendon, Heirs of Bernardo Vasquez (Lydia Vasquez Maturan) all of Surigao City.

Whereas, a verified petition having been filed by counsel of the movants in the above-entitled case, praying for the reconstitution of original certificate of title in accordance with the provisions of Republic Act No. 26, alleging that the original certificate of title covering the above-mentioned Lot No. 1440 was either lost or destroyed during the last war, which lot is more particularly described as follows:

"A parcel of land, Lot No. 1440 of the cadastral survey of Surigao, situated in the Bo. of Rizal, Municipality of Surigao. Bounded on the NE, by Lots Nos. 1444 and 679; on the SE, by Lot No. 671; on the SE, by Lot No. 1441; and on the NW, by Lot No. 1432, containing an area of fifty seven thousand five hundred and forty-five (57,545) square meters more or less.

Wherefore, you are hereby notified that the hearing of the petition will take place on July 17, 1975, at 8:00 o'clock A.M. in the Session Hall of the Court, Branch I, Surigao City.

Witness, the Honorable Oscar M. Herrera, Judge of this Court, this 17th day of April 1975, at Surigao City, Philippines.

(Sgd.) MARIETTA E. EVIOTA
Clerk of Court

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NUEVA
VIZCAYA

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BAYOMBONG
BRANCH I

CASE No. 4264 CADASTRAL CASE No. 17 CADASTRAL
RECORD No. 887 Lot No. 2534—Petition for the
Reconstitution of the Original and Owner's
Duplicate of Certificate of Title No. (NA),
Free Patent No. 3895 and for the cancellation
of the same giving way to the issuance of TCT
in accordance with Cadastral Case No. 17,
Cadastral Record No. 887, Lot No. 2534, Ba-
yombong Cadastre Survey,

ANTONIO LASAM ET AL., Petitioners

NOTICE OF HEARING

To: The Commissioner, Land Registration Com-
mission, Quezon City, the Director of Lands,
the Solicitor General, both of Manila; the
Provincial Governor, Bayombong, Nueva Viz-
caya; the Parish Priest of Bayombong, Nueva
Vizcaya; the District Highway Engineer, the
Provincial Fiscal, Maria Infante, Victoriano
Flores, Marcelino Degamo, Ramon Cabauatan,
all of Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya; Atty. Ro-
dolfo Q. Agbayani, counsel for the petitioners,
Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya; and to all whom
it may concern:

Whereas, a verified petition has been filed with
this Court by Antonio Lazam et al, all of Bayom-

bong, Nueva Vizcaya, for the reconstitution of the
original and owner's duplicate of Certificate of
Title No. (NA), Free Patent No. 3895 and for
the cancellation of the same, and in lieu thereof,
the issuance of a Transfer Certificate of Title in
accordance with Cadastral Case No. 17, Cadastral
Record No. 887, issued in the name of Santiago
Cutaran who was correspondingly issued Cer-
tificate of Title No. (NA), covering a parcel of
land now designated as Lot No. 2534 of the Ba-
yombong Cadastre. "x x x Bounded on the NE.,
by Lots 2526, 2527, and 2528 of Bayombong Ca-
dastre 45 Extension; on the SE., by Lots 2535,
2946 and 2547 of Bayombong Cadastre 45 Exten-
sion; on the SW., by Road and on the NW., by
Lots 2548 and 2533 of Bayombong Cadastre 45
Extension * * *; containing an area of twenty-five
thousand four hundred twenty-eight square me-
ters (25,428), more or less. * * *"

Wherefore, you are hereby given notice that the
petition has been set for hearing on September 9,
1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the morning, before
Branch — of the Court of First Instance of
Nueva Vizcaya, at Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, on
which date, time and place you should appear and
file your claim and objection if you have, to said
petition.

Witness, the Honorable Gabriel Dunuan, Presid-
ing Judge of this Court, this 6th day of March,
1975, at Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya.

(Sgd.) TRANQUILINO V. RAMOS

[18-20]

Acting Clerk of Court

ERRATA

Corrections made in the publication of Notices of Initial Hearing of the Land Registration Commission:

In Land Registration Case No. N-941, of the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, VICENTE SERRANO, JR., applicant, LRC Record No. N-38627, appearing in the issues of June 15 and 22, 1970, Volume 66, Nos. 24 and 25, pages 5872 and 6118, respectively—

The tracing cloth plan should be Psu-200861 instead of Psu-20086, as published.

Komisyon sa Patalaan ng Lupain

(LAND REGISTRATION COMMISSION)

[LAST PUBLICATION]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF AKLAN

Land Registration Case No. K-243
LRC Record N-46338

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. VI-5, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Bureau of Lands, Juanito Motus, Maria Trinidad, Juanito Tayco, Clemente Concepcion, Kalibo, Aklan; Salvador D. Sarabia, Felimon R. Requiro Jr. Lydia M. Sarabia, Antero Torres and Clemente Concepcion, Buswang, Kalibo, Aklan; Juan Tayco, Esteban Tolentino, Antonio Macosme Mongan, Eulogio Matanga, and Jesus Menez, New Buswang, Kalibo, Aklan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Heirs of Julio Magno represented by Nestora R. Magno Buswang, Kalibo, Aklan, assisted by Atty. Diomedes T. Resurreccion, Banga, Aklan, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1951, Psc-24, Kalibo Cadastre, plan AP-06000058), with the improvements thereon situated in the Barrio of Buswang, Municipality of Kalibo, Province of Aklan. Bounded on the NE., by Visayan Seashore, (now) Cocoland, claimed by the Heirs of Julio Magno et al; on the SE., by property of Juan Tayco; on the SW., by property of Clemente Concepcion, on the W., by properties of Juanito Tayco, Esteban Tolentino, Antonio Macosme Mongan, Eulogio Matanga and Jesus Menez; and on the NW., by property of Maria Trinidad. Point "1" is N. 29 deg. 23 min. W., 752.44 meters from BBM 9, Psc-24 Kalibo, Cadastre. Area sixty-one thousand nine hundred eighty seven (61,987) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Aklan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Kalibo, Province of Aklan, Philippines, on the 28th day of August, 1975, at 8:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time

and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Honorable Dominador L. Quiroz, District Judge of said Court, the 12th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BAGUIO AND BENGUET

Land Registration Case No. N-386
LRC Record No. N-46421

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road; Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Benguet, Mountain Province; the District Land Office No. 1-2, Baguio City; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, La Trinidad, Benguet; Marcos Calgo, Mrs. Shoay Tumpao and Francisco Paran, Puguig, La Trinidad, Benguet; Serapio Tumpao, Pico, La Trinidad, Benguet; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Carmen Abodelis, Puguig, La Trinidad, Benguet, thru Atty. Bantas Suanding, Rm. 21, Stewart Bldg., Harrison Road, Baguio City, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-1-000495), situated in the Barrio of Pico, Municipality of La Trinidad, Province of Benguet. Bounded on the N., by property of Marcos Calgo; on the SE., by property of Francisco Paran; on the S., by properties of Serapio Tumpao and Carmen Abodelis; and on the NW., by property of Carmen Abodelis. Point "1" is 5 deg. 59 min. W., 1,698.14 meters from

Triangulation La Trinidad Center, La Trinidad, Benguet. Area one thousand four hundred ninety five (1,495) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Baguio and Benguet, at its session to be held in the City of Baguio, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Honorable Generoso A. Buendia, Judge of said Court, the 4th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BAGUIO
AND BENGUET

Land Registration Case No. N-384
LRC Record No. N-46448

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, La Trinidad, Benguet; the District Land Office No. 1-2, the City Mayor, the City Council, the City Fiscal, the City Treasurer, and the City Engineer, Baguio City; Sotino Abanag, Engay Locnoyan, Betty Sumensin, Lindaoan or Lindadan Baldasan Yayag Bantag and Alumno Kidit, Lucnab, Baguio City; Quentino Abanag, Gibraltar Road, Baguio City; Immaculate Heart of Mary Maryhurst Road, Baguio City; Fernando Lopez, Fely Baladad, Outlook Drive, Baguio City; and the Manager, National City Bank of New York, De los Reyes Street, Baguio City; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Josephine M. Abanag, Gibraltar Road, Baguio City, assisted by Atty. Melchor R. Raras

No. 149 I. Siapno Road, Baguio City, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-175614), with the improvements thereon, situated in Lucnab Residential Section D, City of Baguio. Bounded on the NE., by property of the National City Bank of New York; a Public Land and property of Sotino Abanag; on the SE., by properties of Sotino Abanag, Engay Locnoyan, Betty Sumensin; Lindadan Baldasan and Yag-yag Bantag; on the SW., by a Public Land and properties of the Immaculate Heart of Mary and Fernando Lopez; and on the NW., by property of Fely Baladad and a Public Land. Point "1" is S. 53 deg. 32 min. E., 1,194.65 meters from Triangulation Station "D" Baguio Townsite. Area one hundred forty five thousand one hundred ninety-two (145,192) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Baguio and Benguet at its session to be held in the City Hall, City of Baguio, Philippines, on the 3rd day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid your default will be recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Sinforoso Fangonil, Judge of said Court, the 4th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BAGUIO
AND BENGUET

Land Registration Case No. N-390
LRC Record No. N-46792

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, La Trinidad, Benguet; the District Land Office No. 1-2, Baguio City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council,

La Trinidad, Benguet; Daniel Ato, Mateo Lomerez, Maria Olida, Antonio Luna and Gomay Lomerez, Bahong, La Trinidad, Benguet; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Torio Balanban and Tolentino Balanban, Bahong, La Trinidad, Benguet, thru Atty. Bantas Suanding, Room 21, Stewart Bldg., Harrison Road, Baguio City; to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land, situated in the Barrio of Bahong, Municipality of La Trinidad, Province of Benguet. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-223719). Bounded on the N., by property of Daniel Ato; on the NE., by properties of Daniel Ato and Mateo Lomerez; on the E., by Lot 2; on the SE., by property of Antonio Luna; on the SW., by property of Mateo Lomerez; and on the W., by Public Land. Point "1" is N. 5 deg. 29 min. E., 254.70 meters from BLLM 2, Takian, La Trinidad, Benguet, Mt. Province. Area twenty nine thousand nine hundred ninety two (29,992) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-223719). Bounded on the NE., by property of Mateo Lomerez; on the E. and SE., by property of Maria Olida; on the SW., by property of Antonio Luna; and on the W., by Lot 1. Point "1" is N. 18 deg. 11 min. E., 438.48 meters from BLBM 2, Takian, La Trinidad. Area seven thousand eight hundred sixty-nine (7,869) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Baguio and Benguet, at its session to be held in the City of Baguio, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Generoso A. Buendia, Judge of said Court, the 6th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.

Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division
084766—9

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BATAAN

Land Registration Case No. N-270
LRC Record No. N-46969

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-5, Balanga, Bataan; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Antonio Labog, Benito Nojadera, Hermogenes Bantugan and Miguel Bantugan, Bagac, Bataan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Municipality of Bagac, represented by Candelaria N. Manalo, Bagac, Bataan, to register and confirm its title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 498, Bagac Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000923), situated in the Barrio of Banawang, Municipality of Bagac, Province of Bataan, Bounded on the NE. by Lot 497 and 495; on the SE. by a Creek; on the SW. by Lots 522, 526 and 529; all of Bagac Cadastre; and on the NW. by the Banawang Creek. Point "1" is N. 10 deg. 49 min. W., 117.67 meters from BLLM 7 Cad-244, Bagac Cadastre. Area seventy thousand eight hundred fifty five (70,855) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Bataan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Balanga, Province of Bataan, Philippines, on the 23rd day of July, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Pedro T. Santiago, Judge of said Court, the 23rd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.

Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

[19, 20]

Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BATANGAS

Land Registration Case No. N-900

LRC Record No. N-46755

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-2, Batangas City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Bauan, Batangas; Angel Aguila, the Heirs of Rosa Panopio namely Crisanta Panopio, Abelina Panopio,

Basilio Panopio, Cripenio Panopio, Benjamin Panopio, Celso Panopio and Norma Panopio, Poblacion, Bauan, Batangas; Alejandro G. Sambo, in behalf of the Heirs of Herbert M. Petersen, Jr. namely Katheryn A. Petersen, Alan Petersen, Eric Petersen, Peter Eric Petersen, Dane Stone, Danglayan, Batangas City; Heirs of Pedro Corona namely Gaudencio Corona, Juliana Corona, Cristeta Corona and Florentino Corona, Aurora P. Silang, Heirs of Ambrosio Panopio and Teodora Ilagan namely Isidro Panopio, Melchor Panopio, Charing Panopio, Maxima Panopio, Rosa Panopio,

Gregorio Panopio, Jose Panopio and Eduardo Panopio, Berina Ilagan or Berina Panopio, Heirs of Melchor Panopio namely Nerisa Panopio and Armando Panopio, Isidro Panopio, Lino Gonzales, Pedro Magnaye or Manage, Basilia Arevalo, Teodoro Ilagan, Cirilo Panopio, Lolita Panopio, Pedro Silang, Felipe Marquez, Emeterio Panopio, Encarnacion Panopio, Maria Panopio, Vicente Panopio, Pascual Silang, Felomino Hernandez, Emilio Medrano, Aniceto Panopio, Sta. Maria, Bauan, Batangas; Universal Mill Supply Company, 1206 M. Naval St., Navotas, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Dynamarine Corporation, represented by its President, Mr. Edgardo R. Carlos, 1206 M. Naval St., Navotas, Rizal thru Atty. Francisco Madlangbayan, Bauan, Batangas to register and confirm its title to the following properties:

Ten (10) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of Sta. Maria, Municipality of Bauan, Province of Batangas. The boundaries of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-238719-Amd.). Bounded on the NE. by the Sta. Maria River and property of the Heirs of Pedro Corona; on the SE. by the Batangas Bay; on the SW. by property of the Heirs of Herbert M. Petersen, Jr.; and on the NW. by Lot 3. Point "1" is S. 69 deg. 28 min. W., 4,145.24 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area one thousand two hundred sixty one (1,261) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-238719-Amd.). Bounded on the NE. by property of Angel Aguila; and on the SE., W. and NW. by the Sta. Maria River. Point "1" is S. 69 deg. 07 min. W., 4,107.64 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area two thousand two hundred fourteen (2,214) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (Lot 3, plan Psu-238719-Amd.). Bounded on the SE. by the Sta. Maria River and Lot 1; on the SW. by property of the Heirs of Herbert M. Petersen, Jr.; and on the NW. by Lot 4. Point "1" is S. 69 deg. 28 min. W., 4,145.24 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area one thousand fifteen (1,015) square meters, more or less.

4. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-04-001036). Bounded on the N. by Lot 2; on the E. by property of Dynamarine Corporation; on the S. by the Batangas Bay; on the W. by property of Pedro Manage; and on the NW. by property of Basilia Arevalo. Point "1" is S. 69 deg. 02 min. W., 4,274.20 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area eight hundred six (806) square meters, more or less.

5. A parcel of land (Lot 3, plan Psu-04-001036). Bounded on the E. by property of Dynamarine Corporation; on the S. by Lot 2; on the SW. by property of Basilia Arevalo; and on the NW. by Lot 4. Point "1" is S. 69 deg. 36 min. W., 4,295.69 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area four hundred sixty one (461) square meters, more or less.

6. A parcel of land (Lot 4, plan Psu-04-001036). Bounded on the NE. by properties of Aurora P. Silang and Dynamarine Corporation; on the SE. by Lot 3; on the SW. by properties of Basilia Arevalo, Pedro Silang and Felipe Marquez; and on the NW. by property of Lolita Panopio. Point "1" is S. 69 deg. 44 min. W., 4,265.30 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area one thousand seven hundred twenty six (1,726) square meters, more or less.

7. A parcel of land (plan Psu-239681). Bounded on the NE. by properties of Filomeno Hernandez, Emilio Medrano and Pedro Corona; on the S. by the Batangas Bay; on the SW. by properties of the Heirs of Rosa Panopio and Pascual Silang & Maria Panopio; and on the NW. by the Provincial Road.

Point "1" is S. 71 deg. 05 min. W., 4,166.50 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area five thousand (5,000) square meters, more or less.

8. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-04-000989). Bounded on the NE. by property of the Heirs of Herbert M. Petersen, Jr.; on the S. by the Batangas Bay; on the SW. by property of Encarnacion, Maria and Vicente Panopio; and on the NW. by Lot 1. Point "1" is S. 70 deg. 29 min. W., 4,194.60 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area three thousand eight hundred ninety three (3,893) square meters, more or less.

9. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-239680 Amd.). Bounded on the NE. by property of the Heirs of Rosa Panopio (before) Dynamarine Corporation (now); on the SE. by Lot 1; on the SW. by properties of the Heirs of Teodora Ilangan, Aniceto Panopio, Heirs of Ambrosio Panopio and Maxima Panopio; and on the NW. by property of Aurora Silang. Point "1" is S. 70 deg. 29 min. W., 4,256.89 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area five thousand three hundred twenty seven (5,327) square meters, more or less.

10. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-239680 Amd.). Bounded on the NE. by property of the Heirs of Rosa Panopio (before) Dynamarine Corporation (now); on the S. by the Batangas Bay; on the SW. by properties of the Heirs of Teodoro Aniceto and Melchor Panopio and Heirs of Teodora Ilangan; and on the NW. by Lot 1. Point "1" is S. 70 deg. 29 min. W., 4,256.89 meters from BLLM 1, Bauan, Batangas. Area four thousand five hundred forty six (4,546) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Batangas, at its session to be held in Branch I, City of Batangas, Philippines on the 29th day of August, 1975, at 8:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Eduardo R. Bengzon, Judge of said Court, the 18th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 5th day of May, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BATANGAS

Land Registration Case No. L-73
LRC Record No. N-46833

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-2, Batangas City; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Taal, Batangas; Flora Maligaya, M. Lodlod, Taal, Batangas; Juan Atienza, Vicente Anorico, Leoncio Mendoza, Candido Atienza, Elpidia Carnero, Cui-tihan, Taal, Batangas; Andrea Barrion, Bolbok, Taal, Batangas; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Consorcia Carnero, Cultihan, Taal, Batangas; thru Atty. Martin A. Biscocho, Buli, Taal, Batangas, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

Two (2) parcels of land with improvement thereon situated in the Barrio of Bolbok, Municipality of Taal, Province of Batangas. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-04-002057), bounded on the NE., by a Callejon and property of Juan Atienza; on the SE., by properties of Juan Atienza and Vicente Anorico, on the SW., by property of Leoncio Mendoza; and on the NW., by property of Flora Maligaya. Point "1" is N. 63 deg. 33 min. E. 4,013.43 meters from BLLM 1, Taal, Batangas. Area six thousand fifty (6,050) square meters, more or less.

A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-04-002057), bounded on the NE., and SE., by a Callejon; on the SW., by property of Elpidia Carnero; and on the NW. by property of Candido Atienza and Juan Atienza, et al.; Point "1" is N. 66 deg. 33 min. E., 4,002.03 from BLLM 1, Taal, Batangas. Area four thousand five hundred sixty-two (4,562) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Batangas, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Lemery, Province of Batangas, Philippines, on the 11th day of September, 1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be

recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Francisco Mat. Riodique, Judge of said Court, the 7th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BATANGAS

Land Registration Case No. N-379

LRC Record No. N-46893

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, and the District Land Office No. IV-2, Batangas City; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Calaca, Batangas; Raymundo Castillo, Balbino Endozo and Ruperto Marasigan, Pantay, Calaca, Batangas; Marcela Asuncion, Poblacion, Calaca, Batangas; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Pedro Marasigan, Poblacion, Calaca, Batangas, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-04-001541), situated in the Barrio of Pantay, Municipality of Calaca, Province of Batangas. Bounded on the NE., and E., by a creek; on the SE., by property of Ruperto Marasigan; on the SW., by a dry creek and property of Raymundo Castillo; and on the NW., by property of Balbino Endozo. Point "1" is N. 3 deg. 49 min. E., 3,169.69 meters from BLBM 1 Bo. Bagong Tubig, Calaca, Batangas. Area fifty seven thousand nine hundred sixty six (57,966) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Batangas, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Balayan, Province of Batangas, Philippines on the 20th day of August,

1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Jaime de los Angeles, Judge of said Court, the 31st day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BULACAN

Land Registration Case No. N-3169

LRC Record No. N-44798

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Malolos, Bulacan; the District Land Office No. III-6, Tabang, Guiguinto, Bulacan; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Balagtas, (Bigaa) Bulacan; Pilar Garcia, the Heirs of Vicenta Sanchez, the Heirs of Antonio Pahati, Juan Voluntad, Jose Roque, the Heirs of Rosalina Ramirez, Hugo Santiago, Agapito Cubalquinto, Ismael de Jesus, Agapita Mercado, the Heirs of Paz Espina, Concepcion Constantino Agaton Garcia, Rosa Reyes, Estefania Evangelista, Pio Geraldez Paz de Guzman, Paz Espina, Domingo Pacheco and Nieves Ira, San Juan, Balagtas (Bigaa) Bulacan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Teresita Clara C. Perez and the spouses Simplicio S. P. Cruz and Amparo C. Cruz, Poblacion, Sta. Maria, Bulacan; thru Atty. Manuel P. Punzalan, Malolos, Bulacan; to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land, situated in the Barrio of San Juan, Municipality of Balagtas (Bigaa), Province of Bulacan. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 3056 Cad. 333, Bigaa Cadastre, plan Ap-23817). Bounded on the N., NE. and NW., by property of the Heirs of Paz Espina; on the E., by property of Juan Voluntad; on the SE., by properties of Hugo Santiago and Rosalina; on the SW., by properties of Rosalina Ramirez (before); Agapito Cubalquinto (now); and Vicente Sanchez, (before) Ismael de Jesus (now); and on the W., by properties of Agapita Mercado and the Heirs Paz Espina. Point "1" is S. 19 deg. 20 min. E., 737.19 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 333 Bigaa Cadastre. Area five thousand one hundred ninety three (5,193) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 3095 Cad. 333, Bigaa Cadastre, plan Ap-23817). Bounded on the N. & NW., by property of Vicenta Sanchez; on the NE., by property of Rosalina Ramirez; on the SE., by properties of Juan Voluntad and Jose Roque; on the S., by property of Antonio Pahati; and on the W., by property of Pilar Garcia. Point "1" is S. 15 deg. 48 min. E., 873.70 meters from BLLM 1, Cad-333, Bigaa Cadastre. Area three thousand three hundred forty nine (3,349) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Bulacan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Malolos, Province of Bulacan, Philippines, on the 12th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Jesus R. De Vega, Judge of said Court, the 13th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BULACAN

Land Registration Case No. N-3293
LRC Record No. N-46246

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the

Provincial Treasurer; the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Malolos, Bulacan; the District Land Office No. III-6, Tabang, Guiginto, Bulacan; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Bocaue, Bulacan; Encarnacion Villanueva, Severina San Jose, Sixto de la Cruz, Agustin Santiago, Santiago Agustin, Heirs of Martin de la Cruz, Leopoldo de la Cruz, Valentina Dizon, Victoria de Lara, Virgilio Cayton, Igulot, Bocaue, Bulacan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Inocencio de la Cruz, Ernesto de la Cruz, Felipe de la Cruz, Segundo de la Cruz and Mercedes de la Cruz, Igulot, Bocaue, Bulacan; to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land, situated in the Barrio of Igulot, Municipality of Bocaue, Province of Bulacan. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 2864, Cad-332, Bocaue Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000689). Bounded on the SE., by a creek; on the S., by Lot 2868; and on the NW., by an alley and properties of the Heirs of Martin de la Cruz and Ernesto de la Cruz. Point "1" is S. 67 deg. 18 min. E., 1,499.55 meters from BLLM 1, Cad-332, Bocaue Cadastre. Area two hundred forty one (241) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2868, Cad. 332, Bocaue Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000689). Bounded on the N., by Lot 2864; on the SE., by a Creek; and on the W., by an alley and property of the Heirs of Martin de la Cruz. Point "1" is S. 67 deg. 18 min. E., 1,499.55 meters from BLLM 1, Cad-332, Bocaue Cadastre. Area four hundred four (404) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Bulacan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Malolos, Province of Bulacan, Philippines, on the 12th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Jesus R. De Vega, Judge of said Court, the 13th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BULACAN

Land Registration Case No. N-3315
LRC Record No. N-46574

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Malolos, Bulacan; the District Land Office No. III-6, Tabang, Guiguinto, Bulacan; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Administrator, National Irrigation Administration, Plaridel, Bulacan; Ricardo Reyes, Felicidad San Pedro, Aquino Esguerra, Sesinando Reyes c/o Marta Reyes, Salud Andan c/o Aquilina Pascual, Felimon Espino c/o Ex-Mayor Juan Espino, the Heirs of Felomina Espino c/o Ex-Mayor Juan Espino, Elisa Bautista, Pedro Villarama, Pulilan, Bulacan; Marcelo San Victores, and Jose Espino, Paltao, Pulilan, Bulacan; Manuel Aguilar c/o Marciano Castro. Poblacion, Plaridel, Bulacan; Leonor Espino c/o Fortunato Espino, the Heirs of Nimencio Calderon c/o Gertrudes Calderon, Pablo Espino c/o Fortunato Espino, Rufino Calderon c/o Emiliana Bantog, Lumbac, Pulilan, Bulacan; Laureana Espiritu c/o Danilo Cruz, Francisco St., Pulilan, Bulacan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Fortunato Espino, Olimpia Espino and Adoracion Espino, Pulilan, Bulacan; and Magdalena Espino, San Rafael, Bulacan, thru Atty. Maxima M. Perlas, Plaridel, Bulacan, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 2111, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000679), situated in the Barrio of Paltao, Municipality of Pulilan, Province of Bulacan. Bounded on the N., by property of Manuel Aguilar; on the E., by an Irrigation Canal; on the SE., by properties of Leonor Espino and Ricardo Reyes; on the S., by property of Aquino Esguerra; on the W., by property of Sesinando Reyes; and on the NW., by property of Marcelo San Victores. Point "1" is N. 33 deg. 04 min. E., 922.09 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre. Area twenty nine thousand five hundred nine (29,509) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 4436, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000679), situated in the Barrio of Peñabatan, Municipality of Pulilan, Pro-

vince of Bulacan. Bounded on the N., by property of Rufino Calderon; on the NE., by properties of Pablo Espino and Laureana Espiritu; on the SE., by property of the Heirs of Nimencio Calderon; and on the SW., by property of Salud Andan. Point "1" is N. 25 deg. 23 min. W., 2,541.81 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre. Area fifteen thousand seven hundred thirty eight (15,738) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (Lot 4408, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000680), situated in the Barrio of Peñabatan, Municipality of Pulilan, Province of Bulacan. Bounded on the N., by properties of Rufino Calderon and Felimon Espino; on the NE., by property of the Heirs of Felomina Espino; on the SE., by property of Laureana Espiritu; on the SW., by property of Leonor Espino. Point "1" is N-23 deg. 12 min. W., 2,518.05 from BLLM 1, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre. Area thirty thousand ninety eight (30,098) square meters, more or less.

4. A parcel of land (Lot 4410, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000680), situated in the Barrio of Peñabatan, Municipality of Pulilan, Province of Bulacan. Bounded on the NE. and SE., by property of the Heirs of Felomina Espino; on the SW., by property of Laureana Espiritu; and on the NW., by Lot 4408. Point "1" is N. 21 deg. 39 min. W., 2,347.93 from BLLM 1, Cad. 345, Pulilan Cadastre. Area three thousand six hundred fifty seven (3,657) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Bulacan, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Malolos, Province of Bulacan, Philippines, on the 15th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Edgardo L. Paras, Judge of said Court, the 21st day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAMARINES
NORTE

Land Registration Case No. N-499
LRC Record No. N-46844

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. V-5, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Generoso Marquez, Emilia Esguerra, Marcela de Napoles, Patricio de Austria, Generosa Quirnalde, Juan Bautista, Rosario de Liñan, Diego Linan, Rosario de Jesus and Aurora de Cena, Daet, Camarines Norte; Jose Tioship, Diego Linan Street, Camarines Norte; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Elisa Manly Tioship, Diego Liñan Street, Daet Camarines Norte, to register and confirm her title to the following property;

A parcel of land (Lot 2 plan Psu-165414) situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Daet, Province of Camarines Norte. Bounded on the NE., by properties of Rosario de Liñan and Aurora de Cena; on the SE., and NW., by properties of Rosario de Liñan and on the SW., by the Diego Road. Point "1" is N. 12 deg. 38 min. E., 630.78 meters BLM 2, Daet, Camarines Norte. Area eight hundred ninety nine (899) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Camarines Norte, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Daet, Province of Camarines Norte, Philippines, on the 11th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Isidoro A. Vera, Judge of said Court, the 11th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:
GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By. GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE

Land Registration Case No. N-1149
LRC Record No. N-46763

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Trece Martires City; the District Land Office No. IV-4, Rosario, Cavite; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Heirs of Vicente Manarin, Heirs of Florentino Timbanan, Elias Maulanin, Fortunata Poblete and Simeona Leandro, Carmona, Cavite; Heirs of Pedro Espiritu, Ambrocio Sarmiento, Felisa Panganiban and Socorro Reyes, Ulong Tubig, Carmona, Cavite; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Bernardo Hebron, Carmona, Cavite; and Dionisia Hebron Mendoza, Imuz, Cavite, thru Atty. Franco L. Loyola, Rms-207-209 Burke Bldg., Escolta, Manila, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1158, Cad. 285 Carmona Cadastre, plan Ap-04-000247), situated in the Barrio of Ulong Tubig, Municipality of Carmona, Province of Cavite. Bounded on the NE., by properties of the Heirs of Vicente Manarin, Elias Maulanin, and Heirs of Florentino Timbanan; on the SE., by a creek and beyond by properties of the Heirs of Pedro Espiritu, Ambrocio Sarmiento, Felisa Panganiban and Socorro Reyes; on the SW., by property of Fortunata Poblete; and on the NW., by property of Bernardo & Dionisia Hebron vs. the Republic of the Philippines. Point "1" is S. 59 deg. 37 min. E., 842.37 meters from BBM 10, Cad. 285, Carmona Cadastre. Area forty three thousand one hundred ninety (43,190) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cavite, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Bacoor, Province of Cavite, Philippines, on the 28th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever

barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ricardo P. Tensuan, Judge of said Court, the 4th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

[19, 20] By. GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE

Land Registration Case No. N-1146
LRC Record No. N-46776

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Trece Martires City; the District Land Office No. IV-4, Rosario, Cavite; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Bacoor, Cavite; Claudia Jimenez, Marcelo Gana, Roberto Jimenez, Catalino Angeles, Delfin Paredes, Salud Haraza, Rufino Catapia, Magtanggol Malinis, Evarista Francisco, Teotimo Paredes and Rufina Catapia, Salinas, Bacoor, Cavite; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Pascuala Sarino, Salinas, Bacoor, Cavite, assisted by Atty. Pedro S. Sarino, Mabolo, Bacoor, Cavite, to register and confirm her title to the following properties:

Four (4) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of Salinas, Municipality of Bacoor, Province of Cavite. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 286, Psu-164199 (Sheet 19), plan Swo-04-000085). Bounded on the NE., by property of Catalino Angeles; on the SE., by properties of Magtanggol Malines and Claudia Jimenez; on the SW., by property of Evarista Francisco; and on the NW., by properties of Rufino Catapia and Catalino Angeles. Point "1" is 19 deg. 09 min. W., 1,903.30 meters from BLLM 1, Bacoor, Cavite. Area three thousand eight hundred eighty one (3,881) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 249, Psu-164199 (Sheet 15), plan Swo-04-000087). Bounded on the NE., by

property of Catalino Angeles; on the SE., by properties of Catalino Angeles and Delfin Paredes; on the SW., by property of Salud Haraza and Lot 259; and on the NW., by property of Roberto Jimenez. Point "1" is S. 14 deg. 32 min. W., 1,966.05 meters from BLLM 1, Bacoor, Cavite. Area three thousand eight hundred twenty six (3,826) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (Lot 259, Psu-164199 (Sheet 15), plan Swo-04-000087). Bounded on the NE., by property of Roberto Jimenez and Lot 249; on the SE., by property of Salud Haraza; on the W., by a Road; and on the NW., by properties of Claudia Jimenez. Point "1" is S. 18 deg. 39 min. W., 1,953.18 meters from BLLM 1, Bacoor, Cavite. Area two thousand sixty seven (2,067) square meters, more or less.

4. A parcel of land (Lot 424, Psu-164199 (Sheet 15), plan Swo-04-000087). Bounded on the NE., by a Road; on the SE., by property of Rufina Catapia; on the SW., by the Imus River; and on the NW., by property of Teotimo Paredes. Point "1" is S. 19 deg. 25 min. W., 1,990.23 meters from BLLM 1, Bacoor, Cavite. Area three hundred twenty two (322) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cavite, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Bacoor, Province of Cavite, Philippines, on the 26th day of August, 1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ricardo P. Tensuan, Judge of said Court, the 4th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

[19, 20] By. GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE

Land Registration Case No. N-1137
LRC Record No. N-46828

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, El-

liptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Trece Martires City; the District Land Office No. IV-4, Rosario, Cavite; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Marcelo Villanueva, Aquilina Torres, Eusebio Bunda, Felipe Caldejon, Isaac Custodio, Francisco Saldo, Deogracias Castro, Elena Bunda and Alberto Bunda, Noveleta, Cavite; Guillermo Reyes, Jr., Maximina Tirona and Antonino Monton, Sta. Rosa, Noveleta, Cavite; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the spouses Arturo Velasco and Florentina Magos, Kawit, Cavite, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-253446), situated in the Barrio of Sta. Rosa, Municipality of Noveleta, Province of Cavite. Bounded on the NE., by properties of Aquilina Torres, Eusebio Bunda et al. Elena Bunda et. al and Felipe Caldejon; on the S., by the Irrigation Canal and by property of Isaac Custodio; on the W., by the Irrigation Canal and by the San Francisco de Malabon Estate, property of Francisco Saldo; and on the NW., by properties of Deogracias Castro, Alberto Bunda et al and Marcelo Villanueva. Point "1" is S. 17 deg. 16 min. E., 817.24 meters from BLLM 10, Noveleta, Cavite. Area twenty nine thousand one hundred thirty-eight (29,138) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cavite, at its session to be held in the City of Cavite, Philippines, on the 15th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ernani Cruz Paño, Judge of said Court, the 19th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19,20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CAVITE

Land Registration Case No. N-1156
LRC Recrd No. N-46886

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Trece Martires City; the District Land Office No. IV-4, Rosario, Cavite; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Kawit, Cavite; Demetria Olaes, Filomena Napalan, Modesta Celestial, Raymunda Quemuel, Porfirio Encarnacion, Rosauro Santiago, Magdalena Siongson, Avelina Safflor, Regina Encarnacion and Dionicio Encarnacion, Sta. Isabel, Kawit, Cavite; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Rosa Manalo, Emiliano Manalo, Rodolfo Manalo and Lydia Manalo, Sta. Isabel, Kawit, Cavite, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land, situated in the Barrio of Sta. Isabel, Municipality of Kawit, Province of Cavite. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-246641). Bounded on the NE., by property of Demetria Olaes; on the SE., by the Barrio Road; on the SW., by property of Filomena Napalan; and on the NW., by Lot 2 (property of Emiliano & Rodolfo Manalo) and property of Demetria Olaes. Point "1" is N. 12 deg. 16 min. E., 81.53 meters from BLLM 2, Cad. 203, Kawit Cadastre. Area five hundred eighty two (582) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-246641). Bounded on the NE., by property of Demetria Olaes; on the SE., by Lot 1 (property of Rosa Manalo) and property of Filomena Napalan; on the SW., by property of Filomena Napalan; and on the NW., by property of Modesta Celestial. Point "1" is N. 12 deg. 16 min. E., 81.53 meters from MBM 2, Cad. 203, Kawit Cadastre. Area four hundred ten (410) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Cavite, at its session to be held in the City of Cavite, Philippines, on the 16th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place afore-

said, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ernani Cruz Paño, Judge of said Court, the 2nd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LAGUNA

Land Registration Case No. B-459
LRC Record No. N-46272

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-5, Santa Cruz, Laguna, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Cabuyao, Laguna; Isabel Ocampo, Quintin Candulisan, Paz G. Limcaoco, David Antioquia, Romana Baterisma, Elena Baterisma, Arcadio Baterisma, Heirs of Cenon Baterisma, Ramona Baterisma, Sebastian Baterisma, Rosendo Hain, Arcadio Baterisma, Francisco Baterisma, Victoriano Candulisan, Elias Baterisma, Erlinda Aransanso, Niugan, Cabuyao, Laguna; the Manager, San Miguel Corporation, Ayala Avenue, Makati, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Spouses Zoilo C. Alberto and Pilar Mareo Alberto, Biñan, Laguna, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-04-001164), with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Niugan, Municipality of Cabuyao, Province of Laguna. Bounded on the E. by the National Road; and on the SE., SW., & NW. by property of Pilar Mareo (before) San Miguel Corporation (now). Point "1" is N. 11 deg. 31 min. W., 120.33 meters from BLBM 2, Niugan, Cabuyao, Laguna. Area three thousand one hundred seventy-nine (3,179) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Laguna, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Biñan, Province of Laguna, Philippines, on the 31st day of July, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Herminio A. Avendaño, Judge of said Court, the 8th day of May, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 8th day of May, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LAGUNA

Land Registration Case No. N-19
LRC Record No. N-46852

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-5, Santa Cruz, Laguna; the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Siniloan, Laguna; the Board of Regents, Quezon U. P. Land Grant, Severo Barba, Anieto Duller and Baldomero Pontevedra, Kapatalan, Siniloan, Laguna; and to all whom it may concern.

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Baybay National College of Agriculture and Technology, represented by Roque C. Pacariem, Siniloan, Laguna, to register and confirm its title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot I-A Nr-129-D plan Swo-04-000024) situated in the Barrio of Kapatalan, Municipality of Siniloan, Province of Laguna. Bounded on the N., E., and S. by Lot 1-B; and on the W., by properties of Baldomero Pontevedra and Severo Barba (before) Anieto Duller (now); Point "1" is 15 deg. 02 min. W., 4,026.30 meters from BLBM,

3, Kapatalan, Public Land Subdivision Pls-358. Area one million twenty-two (1,000,022) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Laguna, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Siniloan, Province of Laguna, Philippines, on the 10th day of September 1975, a 9:00 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Florentino M. Villanueva, Judge of said Court, the 10th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LAGUNA
AND SAN PABLO CITY

Land Registration Case No. S-518
LRC Record No. N-46862

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-5, Santa Cruz, Laguna; the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Ladislao Arida, Cristita Mardia, Rosita de Villa, Francisco Masajo, Felisa Almendrala, Ricardo Castañeda, Salome Linga and Socoro Linga, Alaminos, Laguna; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the spouses Leon M. Devilla and Letecia Castillo, Alaminos, Laguna, thru Atty. Loreto M. Masa, Cabuyao, Laguna, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-230786, Sheet 1.) with the improvements thereon, situated in the

Poblacion, Municipality of Alaminos, Province of Laguna. Bounded on the NE., by properties of Ladislao Arida and Cristita Mardia; on the SE., by property of Rosita de Villa; on the SW., by property of Francisco Masajo; and on the NW., by the Provincial Road. Point "1" is N. 89 deg. 28 min. W., 162.04 meters from BLLM 2, Alaminos, Laguna. Area four hundred forty-eight (448) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Laguna, at its session to be held in the City of San Pablo, Philippines, on the 15th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Conrado T. Limcaoco, Judge of said Court, the 21st day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LA UNION

Land Registration Case No. N-1495
LRC Record No. N-46547

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. I-1, the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, San Fernando, La Union; the Heirs of Fulgencia Alviar, Honorata or Honorato Hufana, Dy Bin King, Francisco L. Baliton, Ramon Hufana and Fulgencia Alviar, Pagdaran, San Fernando, La Union; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Agripina Alviar, Poblacion, San Fernando, La Union, thru Atty. Pedro O. Arciaga, San Fernando, La Union, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-252963) situated in the Barrio of Pagdaracan, Municipality of San Fernando, Province of La Union. Bounded on the E. and SE., by property of the Heirs of Fulgencia Alviar; on the SW., by properties of Honorata or Honorato Hufano and Francisco L. Baliton; on the W. by the National Road; and on the NW., by the Carlatan River. Point "1" is S. 39 deg. 18 min. E. 505.75 meters from BLBM 1, Carlatan, San Fernando, La Union. Area eleven thousand two hundred thirty-nine (11,239) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of La Union, at its session to be held in the Municipality of San Fernando, Province of La Union, Philippines, on the 8th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Jose P. Flores, Judge of said Court, the 14th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF LA UNION

Land Registration Case No. A-175
LRC Record No. N-46891

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. I-1, and Jose T. Zanduetta, San Fernando, La Union; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Maria Mendoza Vda. de Quinto and the Heirs of Fruto Ofiana, Agoo, La Union; and the Heirs of Francisco Mabansag, San Nicolas, Agoo, La Union; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Milagros Calma Vda. de Mabansag,

No. 132-E, Agusan Street, La Loma, Quezon City, thru Atty. Telesforo N. Ofiana, Agoo, La Union, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 2, Plan Psu-144229), situated in the Barrio of San Nicolas, Municipality of Agoo, Province of La Union. Bounded on the NE., by Burgos Street; on the SE., by Lot 1, property of Jose T. Zanduetta; on the SW., by the Heirs of Fruto Ofiana; and on the NW., by property of Maria Mendoza Vda. de Quinto. Point "1" is S. 57 deg. 48 min. W., 345.92 meters from BLBM 1, Agoo, La Union. Area three hundred twelve (312) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of La Union, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Agoo, Province of La Union, Philippines, on the 5th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Antonio G. Bautista, Judge of said Court, the 3rd day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF
MARINDUQUE

Land Registration Case No. N-140
LRC Record No. N-45920

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-7, the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Boac, Marinduque; Juan Buñag, Poblacion, Boac, Marinduque; Matilde Meneses or Menes and Estela Estareja, Cawit, Boac, Marinduque, Philippines; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Redolfo M. Tan, Cawit, Boac, Marinduque, thru Atty. Salvador B. Jamilla, Boac, Marinduque; to register and confirm his title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land with the improvement thereon, situated in the Barrio of Cawit, Municipality of Boac, Province of Marinduque. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan-Psu-238619). Bounded on the N., by property of Juan Buñag; on the NE., by lot 2; on the S. by a Barrio Road; and on the W. by property of Matilde Maneses or Menes. Point "1" is S. 14 deg. 08 min. W., 7,596.69 meters from Boac Church Tower, Marinduque. Area three hundred two (302) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-238619). Bounded on the NE., by the National Road; on the S., by a Barrio Road; on the SW., by Lot 1; and on the NW., by property of Juan Buñag. Point "1" is S. 14 deg. 08 min. W., 7,596.69 meters from Boac Church Tower, Marinduque. Area seventy-five (75) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Marinduque, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Boac, Province of Marinduque, Philippines, on the 16th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Rosalio A. de Leon, Judge of said Court, the 11th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NUEVA
ECIJA

Land Registration Case No. Gp-130
LRC Record No. N-46846

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform,

Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-2, Cabanatuan City; the Municipal Mayor, and the Municipal Council, San Leonardo, Nueva Ecija; Catalina Salonga, Rosario Payumo, Beatriz Salonga and Roman Salonga, San Anton, San Leonardo, Nueva Ecija; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Iglesia ni Cristo represented by Eraño G. Manalo, Executive Minister and Administrator Corner Central and Commonwealth Avenues, Diliman, Quezon City; thru Tafalla, Cruz & Associates by Atty. Felix Gagarin, Central and Commonwealth Avenues, Diliman, Quezon City; to register and confirm its title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 3555, Cad-324-D, San Leonardo Cadastre plan Ap-03-001004) situated in the Barrio of San Anton, Municipality of San Leonardo, Province of Nueva Ecija. Bounded on the NE., by the Provincial Road; on the SE., by property of Rosario Payumo; on the SW., by the Pampanga River; and on the NW., by property of Catalina Salonga; Point "1" is S. 50 deg 07 min. W, 5,514.95 meters from BLIM 1, Cad-324-D San Leonardo Cadastre. Area one thousand three hundred twelve (1,312) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Nueva Ecija, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Gapan, Province of Nueva Ecija, Philippines, on 28th day of August, 1975. 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Teofilo Guadez, Jr. Judge of said Court, the 15th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division

[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA

Cadastral Case No. N-1
LRC Cadastral Record No. N-403

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council and Pedro Trinidad, Sexmoan, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Lubao, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Macabebe, Pampanga; Marvin Buendia,

Ladislac Aguilar, Teodulo Baltazar, Heirs of Benito Baltazar, Heirs of Federico Bamba, Ireneo Bamba, Heirs of Feliciano Banal, Heirs of Jose Cabrera, Heirs of Maria Calma, Francisco Capuli, Heirs of Lorenzo Castro, Florentino Carlos, Eloy Cortez, Emilio de la Cruz, Sabina de la Cruz, Marcela de la Cruz, Juan Cubacub, Heirs of Mauro Diciembre, Margarita Garcia, Marta Vda. de Limpin Garcia, Heirs of Andres Guzman, Felomene Isip, Reperto Lacsamana, Heirs of Simeon Laus, Agustina Laxa, Heirs of Tranquilino Laxa, Heirs of Mateo Laxa,

Bernandina Laxa, Praxedes Laxa, Agapito Laxa, Jacinto Laxa, Bernabe de Leon, Valeriano de Leon, Blas de Leon, Meliton Licup, Francisca Vda. de Limin, Fabiana Limin, Ernestino Limpin, Heirs of Crispulo Limpin, Luciano Limpin, Heirs of Feliciano Limpin, Ramon Lucas, Ambrocio de Luna, Heirs of Manuel Luna, Heirs of Simeona de Luna, Juan Luna, Juan Nacaspac, Valentina Nagtuloy, Carmen Maninang, Lczenza Manliclic, Heirs of Eftacio Manliclic, Heirs of Apolinaria Manliclic, Lucia Manliclic, Heirs of Juan Manulid, Heirs of Ciprano Marucut, Martin Matitu, Jose Matitu, Heirs of Eugenia Matitu, Heirs of Juan Matitu, Heirs of Mercedes Tungcab, Juan Tungcab, Teodulo Navarro, Heirs of Petronilo Regala, Romulo Mercado, Mariano Mercado, Heirs of Lorenzo Mercado, Amparo Vda. de Mercado, Heirs of Monico Mercado, Heirs of Lorenzo Mercado, Victoria Mercado, Jose Peña, Simplicio Maninang, Heirs of Luis de Luna, Juan Reyes, Florencio Miranda,

Elena Naluz, Perfecto Navarro, Heirs of Pedro Nino, Maxima Nino, Heirs of Bonifacio Panlagui, Emilio Panlagui, Serafin Pinlac, Anastacio Pinlac, Heirs of Francisco Piring, Heirs of Hilarion Pring, Eulalia Vda. de Regala, Julian Regala, Anastacio Regala, Isaac Regala, Eduardo Rivera, Ruben Roncal, Felix Saldi, Marcelino Santos, Pedro Simbul, Simeona Laxa, Pedro Simon, Gavino Suing, Heirs of Felix Tamayo, Nicolas Tasic, Jose Ticalco, Alfonso Lucia, Pedro Trinidad, Mamerto Tungul, Teodoro Umlas, Felix Macario, Gregoria Umlas, San Nicolas 1st. Sexmoan, Pampanga; Victorio Cubacub, Guillermo Kapate,

Demetria Laxa, Demetria Laxa, Leonida de Laki, Esteban Pring, Heirs of Sotero Agapito, Heirs of Angel Aguilar, Eusebio Limin, Heirs of Gregorio Aguilar, Gregorio Aguilar, Heirs of Olaro Aguilar, Macaria Vda. de Aguilar, Angeles Francisco, Heirs of Benita Alipio, Crispulo Alipio, Francisco Angeles, Raymundo Angeles, Heirs of Gregorio Apostol, Alfonso Araullo, Arsenio Arce, Edilberto Arce, Heirs of Francisco Arce, Juliana de Luna Arce, Monico Arce, Jr., Heirs of Pascual Arce, Heirs of Pedro Arce, Ricardo Arce, Teodoro Arce, Vicente Arce, Heirs of Francisco Bamba,

Jesus Bamba, Heirs of Roman Banal, Heirs of Longina Banal, Segundo Basco, Generosa Basco, Simplicio Tamayo, Damaso Cabais, Luis Cabrera, Modesto Cabrera, Heirs of Benedicto Cabrera, Vicente Cabrera, Vicente Cabrera, Silvino Cabrera, Luis Cabrera, Clemente Caladiao, Leoncio Caladiao, Fortunato Calma, Heirs of Agapita Calma, Heirs of Dionisio Castro, Ceferino Castro, Jesus T. Cruz, Heirs of Ignacio de la Cruz, Heirs of Florencio Cubacub, Leoncio Cubacub, Simeon Cubacub, Feliciano Cubacub, Heirs of Luciano Dimarucut,

Eugenio Gagui, Maria Garcia, Jose Garcia, Pablo Gonzales, Benito Guevarra, Francisco Guevarra, Heirs of Domingo Guevarra, Elena Guevarra, Marta Guevarra, Heirs of Eugenio Guevarra, Heirs of Lorenzo Guevarra, Pedro Guevarra, Guillermo Kapate,

Ignacio Lacs, Leonida Vda. de Laki, Mariano Lacs, Demetria Lacs, Cecilio Laxa, Florentino Laxa, Heirs of Pedro Laxa, Mariano Laxa, Sixto Laxa, Heirs of Felipe Laxa, Heirs of Nicolas Lerit, Maria Limin, Heirs of Marcela Limin, Cornelio Lipin, Metodio Limin, Miguel Limin, Heirs of Blas Limin, Gavino Limin, Timotea Limin, Heirs of Rita Limin, Heirs of Nicolas Limin, Andres Limin, Lorenzo Ramona Aguilar, Clemente Cubacub, Florentina Cubacub, Dionisia Pinlac, Limin, Heirs of Simplicio Limin, Heirs of Emilia Limpin, Heirs of Valeriana Limpin, Heirs of Felipe Limpin,

Feliciana Limpin, Heirs of Paula Limpin, Ambrocio Limpin, Mariano de Luna, Heirs of Mariano Luna, Heirs of Juan Pantig, Mariano Magpayo, Gabriel Manganti, Segundina Marucut, Felix Marucut, Felimon Marucut Rosario Marucut, Osmundo Mercado, Estanislao de Mesa, Heirs of Agustin Montemayor, Benito P. Montemayor, Agustin Montemayor, Antonio Pinlac, Raymundo Angeles, Lorenzo Limin, Pedro Guevarra, Mateo Pinlac, Heirs of Roman Pantig, Heirs of Nicolas Lerit, Heirs of Severo Pring, Heirs of Mariano Pantig, Heirs of Florentina Piring, Heirs of Felipe Limpin, Rosarlo Marucut, Heirs of Paula Limpin.

Sineon Naluz, Heirs of Clemente Salonga, Heirs of Roman Banal, Dionisia Pinlac, Sixto Laxa, Heirs of Domingo Regala, Ambrocio Limpin, Jose Panganiban, Fausto Saldi, Ambrocio Limpin, Heirs of Felipe Limpin, Heirs of Felipe Laxa, Florentina Pantig, Heirs of Mariano Pantig, Heirs of Severo Piring, Ambrocio Piring, Mariano de Luna, Mateo Pinlac, Arsenio Arce, Luis Banal, Fortunato Suing, Maria Garcia, Heirs of Antonio Pinlac, Anastacia Pring, Romulo Mercado, Pacencia Ocampo, Feliciano Limpin, Fermin Dominador, Heirs of Juana Naluz, Juan Naluz, Simon Naluz,

Pacencia Ocampo, Tirso Panganiban, Jose Panganiban, Inocencio Pangilinan, Heirs of Silverio Pangilinan, Mariano Paulagui, Atanacio Panlagui, Maria Pantig, Heirs of Francisco Pantig, Froilano Pantig, Estanislao Pantig, Cecilio Pantig, Heirs of Juan Pantig, Heirs of Roman Pantig, Heirs of Mariano Pantig, Guillermo Paulo, Jacinto Peña, Manuel Peña, Nacisa Perez, Ramon Pinlac, Heirs of Gaspar Pinlac, Heirs of Jugo Pinlac, Heirs of Segundo Pinlac, Heirs of Toribio Pinlac, Pedro Pinlac, Felix Pinlac, Lamberto Pinlac, Antonia Laxa Vda. de Pinlac, Heirs of Antonio Pinlac, Felicianna Pinlac, Hilario Nagtuloy,

Mateo Pinlac, Toribio Pinlac, Heirs of Florentina Piring, Heirs of Severo Piring, Esteban Pring, Heirs of Florentina Pring, Heirs of Pedro Razon, Domingo Razon, Arsenio Regala, Clemente Regala, Heirs of Juan Regala, Panganiban, Inocencio Pangilinan, Heirs of Domingo Regala, Margarita Regala, Eduardo Rivera, Procesa Sarmiento, Eduardo Rivera, Heirs of Eduardo Rivera, Severo Roncal, Heirs of Ciriaco Roncal, Fortunato Sacdalan, Gaudencio Sacdalan, Restituto Saldaña, Heirs of Clementa Salonga, Macario Salonga, Heirs of Fausto Saldi, Pedro Sandiego, Heirs of Hermodgenes Razon, Francisco Arca Sapnu, Alejandro Saldaña, Procesa Sarmiento, Ricardo Velez, Heirs of Cipriano Sibug, Heirs of Fausto Sibug, Laurencia Sibug,

Ramona Sibug, Heirs of Teogines Sibug, Negala Soma, Heirs of Agustin Simbul, Romualdo Simbul, Maria Simpaio, Emilia Simpaio, Heirs of Ambrocio Suing, Anacleto Suing, Martina Suing, Mercedes Suing, Antonio Tamayo, Antonio Razon Tamayo, Jorge Tamayo, Jesus Tamayo, Guillermo Torres, Pedro Torres, Pedro Trinidad, Heirs of Quirino Tungul, Feliciano Turla, Felipe Turla, Genoveva Turla, Jose Umlas, Pilotea Visda, Heirs of Francisco Visda, Heirs of Mariano Visda, Roman Visda, Heirs of Agaten Yamat, Sto. Tomas, Sexmoan, Pamanga; Heirs of Sotero Agapito, Heirs of Angel Aguilar, Heirs of Antonio Aguilar, Raymunda Beltran, Eleno Aguilar, Ladislao Aguilar, Lorenzo G. Aguilar,

Matias Aguilar, Miguel Aguilar, Leopoldo Alipio, Caridad Laus Baltazar, Heirs of Francisco Baltazar, Jose Baltazar, Gregorio Baltazar, Teodulo Baltazar, Miguel Baltazar, Simeon Baltazar, Pedro Baltazar, Heirs of Anastacia Baltazar, Dominga Vda. de Baltazar, Venancio Baltazar, Caridad Vda. de Baltazar, Juan Baltazar, Simeon Bamba, Pedro Baltazar, Jose Baltazar, Heirs of Casimiro Baltazar, Miguel Baltazar, Heirs of Simeon Bamba, Heirs of Jorge Bamba, Dionisia Bamba, Heirs of Dionisio Bamba, Galicano Bamba, Heirs of Carlos Bamba,

Esteban Bamba, Heirs of Anselmo Mangila, Aurelio Pantig, Marcelo Tamayo, Saturnina Bamba, Esteban Bamba, Pedro Limpin, Juan Baltazar, Ines Maninang, Vicente Pena, Victor Unlas, Heirs of Miguel Medrano, Aurelio Pantig, Marcelo Tamayo, Saturnina Bamba, Heirs of Anselma Mangila, Pedro Limpin, Vicente de la Peña, Vicente Umlas, Miguel Medrano, Raymunda Beltran, Antonio Bustos, Alejandro Bengco, Evaristo Cabrera, Heirs of Antonio Cabrera, Modesto Cabrera, Godofredo Caladiao, Heirs of Simplicio Caladiao, Heirs of Felix Calma,

Clara Vda. de Canlas, Heirs of Damaso Castro, Maria Cordova, Felix Cubacub, Enrique de la Cruz, Gonzalo Jacson, Generosa Cubacub, Dionisio Danan, Heirs of Anastacia Matitu, Dalmacia Garcia, Florencio Cagui, Luciano Mercado, Segundina Garcia, Luis Garcia, Heirs of Jose Aguilar, Simeon Bamba, Julian Lauc, Heirs of Flaviano Mamangon, Heirs of Narciso Mangalindan, Florencio Mangila, Tom. Pena, Heirs of Ana Tamayo, Justo Garcia, Heirs of Teodoro Garcia, Heirs of Ramona Garcia, Heirs of Jugo Garcia, Adriano Guevarra,

Victorina Herrera, Heirs of Agapito Isip, Benito Isip, Exequiel Isip, Heirs of Rafaela Isip, Heirs of Veniano Laoc, Heirs of Pedro Laoc, Beatriz Laza, Macario Laxa, Gregorio

Laxa, Maxima Laxa, Agapito Laxa, Estanislao Laxa, Tomas Laxa, Matias Leon, Adriano Limin, Marcelino Limin, Delfin Limpin, Macaria Limpin, Bartolome Limpin, Pedro Limpin, Eustaquia Liwalas, Heirs of Pedro Mangalindan, Ines Mangalindan, Jose Mangalindan, Leodegario Manganti, Doroteo Manganti, Magdalena Manganti, Heirs of Sisenando Mangila, Heirs of Anselma Mangila, Maria Mangila, Ines Maninang, Simeon Bamba, Heirs of Catalino Maninang, Remigia Maninang, Epifania Maninong, Heirs of Mariano Manliclic, Generosa Mallari, Segundo Manuel, Juan Manuel,

Engracia Marucut, Anastacia Matitu, Heirs of Miguel Medrano, Luciano Mercado, Potenciana Mercado, Brigido Mercado, Aurelia G. Mercado, Potenciano Mercado, Eusebio Mercado, Brigido Sibug, Heirs of Catalino Naluz, Valentin Navarro, Felicidad Ocampo, Carmen Ong, Concordia Panlagui, Raymundo Panlagui, Baltazar Pantig, Juana Vda. de Magpayo Peña, Heirs of Espiridion Peña, Leonarda Peña, Leonardo Peña, Teodora Peña, Isabel Peña, Heirs of Pantaleon Peña, Leonardo Peña, Heirs of Dalmacio Pinlac, Anastacio Pinlac, Heirs of Ladislao Pring, Feliciano Pring, Valentin Razon, Eliseo Razon,

Domingo Razon, Gabina Razon, Heirs of Alejo Regala, Heirs of Donato Regala, Eufemia San Roman, Braulio Sapnu, Fernando Sapnu, Heirs of Fernando Sapnu, Genaro Sapnu, Hermingilda Sapnu, Heirs of Matias Sapnu, Felisa Sibug, Servanda Sibug, Heirs of Melencio Simbul, Maria Consolacion Simbul, Fortunato Suing, Fidel Suing, Heirs of Crisanto Tamayo, Marcelo Tamayo, Pedro Tamayo, Mercedes G. Tayag, Juana Torres, Jose Torres, Lorenzo Torres, Maria Torres, Pedro Torres, Vicente Torres, Casiano Tungul, Gregoria Tungul, Matias Aguilar, Domingo Turla, Julian Turla, Margarita Turla,

Fortunato Suing, Ereano Umlas, Heirs of Rufino Umlas, Heirs of Vicente Umlas, Heirs of Faustino Vicente, Sta. Lucia, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Romulo Aguas, Eulalio Aguilar, Fernando Baltazar, Rafaela Baltazar, Venevino Banal, Andres Banal, Aguido Cabrera, Macario Cabrera, Feliciano Cortes, Heirs of Antonio Degal, Gonzalo Jceson, Felix Cubacub, Esteban Dagal, Tiburcio Dagal, Beatriz Dagal, Anastacia Dalay, Dionisio Dalay, Heirs of Placido Dalay, Silverio Dalay, Heirs of Julio Mangila, Heirs of Estanislao Pagtalunan, Jose Velasco, Alberto Nuguid, Tirso Dalay,

Alberto Dimasangal, Heirs of Posidio Flores, Heirs of Alejandro Ibay, Mariano Flores, Tomas Flores, Eulogia Manansala, Heirs of Juan Garcia, Francisco Garcia, Heirs of Pedro Guevarra, Francisco L. Gutierrez, Mariano Gutierrez, Heirs of Alejandro Ibay, Gonzalo Josen,

Ariston Laxa, Rafael Licup, Juan Limpin, Heirs of Macaria Ocampo, Heirs of Francisco Tugcab Torres, Heirs of Rufino Limpin, Heirs of Eulogia Manansala, Santiago Mangalindan, Higina Suing, Feliciano Mangalindan, Teodoro Mangalindan, Francisco Mangalindan, Juan Mangalindan,

Maximo Mangalindan, Emilio Panlagui, Heirs of Raymundo Mangila, Heirs of Gaudencio Mangila, Heirs of Tomas Mangila, Martina Mangila, Heirs of Julio Mangila, Zacaria Maninang, Heirs of Ceferino Maninang, Heirs of Alberto Tasio, Teodoro, Maninang, Heirs of Felipe Manliclic, Pablo Manuel, Angel Mercado, Eufemia Mercado, Vicente Naluz, Dionisio Naluz, Heirs of Pedro Naluz, Heirs of Sixto Ocampo, Heirs of Macaria Ocampo, Francisco Tugcab Y Torres, Marciano Ocampo, Estanislao Pagtalunan, Heirs of Lorenzo Regala, Juan Trinidad, Hugo Trinidad, Anastacia Pinlac,

Benigna Vda. de Mercado Razon, Heirs of Alejandro Razon, Gregorio Regala, Nicomeda Regala, Francisco Mangalindan, Pedro delos Reyes, Ciriaco Roneal, Heirs of Silverio Rodriguez, Apolinaria Salonga, Adriano Sapnu, Heirs of Felisa Sapnu, Maria Sapnu, Hermingilda Simbul, Pacencia Vda. de Banal Simbul, Heirs of Simeon Simbul, Timotea Simbul, Jose Suing, Maria Suing, Apolonia Pantig, Simeona Mangila, Juan Trinidad, Julio Pring, Heirs of Modesto Trinidad, Heirs of Pantaleon Tunaon, Heirs of Alberto Tugcab, Andrea Tugcab, Esteban Tugcab, Isidro Tugcab, Maximiana Tugcab, Estanislao Tungul,

Mariana Vda. de Suing Tungul, Vicente Tugcab, Alfronso Umlas, Heirs of Ciriaco Umlas, Adriano Vanta, Cirilio Velasco, Heirs of Melencio Velasco, Patricio Velasco, Remigio Velasco, Ireneo Mangalindan, Romulo Mercado, Timoteo Velasco, Heirs of Isabel Visda, Sta. Monica, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Benito Daag, Marcos Hermoso, Dionisio Laxa, Esteban Lapid, Fortunato Lipad, Rosalio Marucut, Ricardo Velez, Teodulo Baltazar, Jorge Agustin, Melecio Agustin, Victor Aguilar, Longino Alipio, Maximo Aquino, Heirs of Santiago Bengco, Alejandro Bengco, Maria Bernalta, Francisco Bernalta, Maxima Vda. de Blas, Heirs of Maxima Vda. de Blas,

Simeon Blas, Ambrosio de Luna, Heirs of Albina Cabrera, Gervacio Cabrera, Antonio Cabrera, Anacleto Castro, Paulino Cortes, Julio Cortez, Heirs of Juan Cortez, Heirs of Leonora Cortez, Anicia Cruz, Nicolas de la Cruz, Benito Daag, Heirs of Pantaleon Dagal, Jorge Manganti, Pascual Dagal, Dionisio Danan, Heirs of Eugenio Flores, Jose Flores, Heirs of Marcos Gagui, Reynaldo Gagui, Cirilo

Gatdula, Ricardo Velez, Silvina Gaviola, Silvestre Cuese, Quirino Guevarra, Bernabe Gutierrez, Bonifacio Gutierrez, Marcos Hermosa, Carmelino Jose, Sergino Lacsumana, Dionisio Lacsu,

Jacinto Lacsa, Felix Lacsa, Martina Dagal, Demetria Lacsa, Fortunato Lapid, Esteban Lapid, Felix Laus, Sotero Laxa, Remigia Laxa, Constancio M. Laxa, Agapito Laxa, Heirs of Andres Laxa, Martina Dagal, Virgilio Laxa, Gonzalo de Leon, Heirs of Victoriana Lerit, Heirs of Andres Limpin, Heirs of Marcelino Limpin, Cosme Limpin, Heirs of Modesto Maninang, Heirs of Ciriaco Liwalas, Felipe Liwalas, Pelagia Liwalas, Catalino Lopez, Catalino Lorenzo, Ambrocio de Luna, Emilia Manalang, Heirs of Laureano Manalang, Bernabe Manan-sala,

Maxima Mangalindan, Ireneo Mangalindan, Francisco Mangalindan, Juan Mangalindan, Heirs of Jorge Mangante, Dario Manganti, Alvaro Manganti, Heirs of Domingo Manganti, Benita Manganti, Maxima Tolentino, Antonio Manganti, Heirs of Mariano Manganti, Agapito Manganti, Modesta Manganti, Rosalia Manganti, Modesto Maninang, Heirs of Carlos Maninang, Vicente Maninang, Teodoro Maninang, Pedro Mallari, Lorenzo Regala, Pio Mariano, Heirs of Policarpio Marcut, Francisco Mendoza, Heirs of Fausto Mendoza, Heirs of Damaso Mendoza, Alejandro Mendoza, Heirs of Ambrocio Mendoza,

Sixto Rivera, Heirs of Margarita Mendoza, Maria Mendoza, Heirs of Florencio Mendoza, Gabina Mendoza, Ursula Mendoza, Gregorio Mendoza, Heirs of Rosalie Mendoza, Heirs of Sotera Mendoza, Heirs of Damaso Mendoza, Romulo Mercado, Luciano Mercado, Mariano Mercado, Lorenzo Mercado, Lorenzo Sunglao Mercado, Leonida Mercado, Marciano Mercado, Atanacia Mercado, Heirs of Eugenio Mercado, Bernandino Mercado, Moises Naluz, Heirs of Teodoro Naluz, Maria Pagtalunan, Maxima Vda. de Pagtalunan, Genaro Panganiban, Heirs of Sotero Panlagui, Alejandro Panlagui, Guillermo Paulo,

Modesto Maninang, Conrado del Rosario, Juana Limpin, Manuel Piring, Sergio Lacsumana, Manuela Pring, Paulina Pring, Lorenzo Regala, Apolonio Rivera, Heirs of Eulalio Roman, Mariano San Roman, Heirs of Pablo San Roman, Petronilo San Roman, Tito San Roman, Alejandro Saldaña, Restituto Saldaña, Pedro Sandiego, Amado Santos, Leoncia Vda. de Santos, Braulio Sapnu, Heirs of Engracia Sapnu, Teodacio Sapnu, Prudencio Sibug, Servando Pinlac, Pedro Simbul, Heirs of Segundina Simbul, Heirs of Ciriaco Suing, Heirs of Raymundo Suing, Alvaro Tamayo, Aurea Tamayo, Heirs of Basilio Tamayo,

084766—10

Mariano Tamayo, Heirs of Santiago Tamayo, Anecito Tolentino, Esperanza Tolentino, Timoteo Tolentino, Basilio Torres, Heirs of Lorenzo Torres, Gabriel Tungul, Pedro Tungul, Maura Tungul, Ricardo Tungul, Heirs of Miguel Flores, Tirso Tungul, Heirs of Francisco Umlas, Ricardo Velez, Isabel Alcantara, San Pedro, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Agustin Angeles, Heirs of Mariano Angeles, Teodolo Baltazar, Heirs of Servando Bunting, Nicanor Cabral, Jose Cabrera, Epifania Cabrera, Ger-vacio Cabrera, Conrado Caladiao, Heirs of Macario Caladiao, Heirs of Macario Castro, Heirs of Juan Castro, Heirs of Marcelino Castro,

Brigido Castro, Sotera de la Cruz, Francisco Guevarra, Tomas Lacson, Heirs of Vicente Lacas, Heirs of Felix Laue, Heirs of Mariano Laue, Melitona de Leon, Heirs of Cesario Leon, Heirs of Tomas de Limin, Cosme Limpin, Antonio Lopez, Nicanor Lopez, Pablo Lucas, Ambrocio de Luna, Regina de Luna, Santiago de Luna, Heirs of Santiago de Luna, Alberto Magpayo, Anselmo Manganti, Heirs of Bernardino Manganti, Maria Vda. de Mangila, Heirs of Tomas Maninang, Simplicio Maninang, Fabian Maninang, Heirs of Felipe Maninang, Eugenio Maninang, Heirs of Barbara Maninang, Celerina Matitu, Daniel Mercado, Bonifacio Pinlac, Eduardo Rivera,

Epifania Roncal, Conrado del Rosario, Heirs of Graciano Saldi, Leoncio Santos, Jose Suing, Martin Suing, Tecfilo Suing, Pedro Tasic, Heirs of Luis Torres, Agaton Tongcab, Casimiro Turla, Pablo Turla, Heirs of Eulope Unlas, Francisco Unlas, Julian Unlas, Rufina Vda. de Visda and Heirs of Agaton Yamat, San Nicolas 2nd, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Ireneo F. Alipio, Casiano Tungol, Francisco Baltazar, Benigno Regala, Jose Baltazar, Bartolo Lorenzo, Cecilio Dalay, Camilo Dalay, Heirs of Elinio Flores, Heirs of Maximo Limpin, Anastacia U. Manansala, Francisco Mangalindan, Juan Mangalindan, Juan Maninang, Simplicio Maninang, Alfredo Maninang, Gregorio Maninang, Benigno Regala, Marta Rivera, Pedro Tungcab, Julian or Juliana Velasco.

Pedro Velasco and Pedro C. Velasco, San Antonio, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Magno Castro, Geronimo Cruz, Andres de la Cruz, Balbina de la Cruz, Leonida Vda. de Laki, Caridad Limpin, Juan Macaspac, Simplicio Maninang, Ignacio Panganiban, Anastacia Pinlac, Cefirino Pring, Gabina Razon, Deogracias Reyes and Gerardo Silva, San Nicolas, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Leoncia Vda. de Aquino, Marvin Buendia Leonardo Manes, Cipriano Romero, Andres Pascual and Leoncia Aquino Vda. de Santos, Malabon, Rizal; Marcelo de la Cruz, Julo, Malabon, Rizal; Brigido Sibug, San Juan, Rizal; the Municipal Council, Alfonso Araullo, Primitivo Limson, Genoveva Limson, Andres

Pascual, Restituto Saldaña, Ricardo Veles, Alejandro Saldaña and Restituto Saldaña, Guagua, Pampanga; Leonida Laki Vda. de Mercado, Plaza Burgos, Guagua, Pampanga; Heirs of Vicenta Araullo, Sto. Niño, Guagua, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, a petition has been presented to this Court by the Director of Lands, praying that the titles to the following described lands, or the various parcels thereof, be settled and adjudicated:

A parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon, containing an area of 1,263.6260 hectares, more or less, divided into 1,319 lots, situated in the Municipality of Sexmoan, Province of Pampanga, the same being designated as Sexmoan Cadastre, Cad. 306-D, Case 1. Bounded on the NE., by the Municipalities of Guagua and Macabebe, properties of Victorio Cubacub, Leonida de Laki, Demetria Laxa, Guillermo Kapate, Esteban Pring, Alejandro & Restituto Saldaña, Rosalio Marcut, Benito Daag, Esteban Lapid, Fortunato Lapid, Dionisio Laxa, Marvin Buendia, and Ricardo Velez, the First River, the Provincial Road, Guagua River, Sexmoan River, San Pedro River, Dampalit River, Mataba River, Macadsa River, Mapapinit River and the Manampil River; on the E., by the Municipality of Macabebe and the Manampil River; on the SE., by the Municipality of Macabebe, the Manampil River and Limasan River; on the S., by the Municipality of Macabebe and the Limasan River; on the SW., by the Municipality of Macabebe, Sexmoan Cadastre Cad 306-D, Case 2, the Lubao Cadastre, Cad 273, Case 7 property of Sotero de la Cruz, et al. and Lorenzo & Primitivo Lacsamana, the Limasan River, Sexmoan River, Sangravel River, Dalan Vapor River, the Gumi River, Marcos Hermoso, Santa Monica River and the Principal River; and on the NW., by the Lubao Cadastre, Cad 273, Case 7, the Third River and a creek.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on the 29th day of September, 1975 at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to present such claims as you may have to said lands or any portion thereof, and to present evidence if any you have, in support of such claims.

And unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the titles to the lands will be adjudicated and determined in accordance with the prayer of the petition and upon the evidence before the Court, and you will be forever barred from contesting such petition or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Presiding Judge of said Court, the 18th day of January, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 7th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA

Land Registration Case No. N-6
LRC Record No. N-46910

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Santa Rita, Pampanga; Avelino Gopez, Doroteo de los Santos, Virginia Lusung, the Heirs of Basilio de Dios, the Heirs of Apolonio Zapanta, Angelo Soliman, Jose de Dios, Agustin Gaviola, the Heirs of Raymundo de Dios, Doroteo de los Santos, San Isidro, Santa Rita, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Iglesia Ni Cristo, represented by its Executive Minister and Administrator, Eraño G. Manalo, thru Tafalla, Cruz, & Associates, by Atty. Felix Gagarin, Central & Commonwealth Avenues, Diliman, Quezon City; to register and confirm its title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1634, Cad. 377-D, Santa Rita Cadastre, plan Ap-03-001010), situated in the Barrio of San Isidro, Municipality of Santa Rita, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the NE., by properties of the Heirs of Apolonio Zapanta and Angelo Soliman; on the SE., by property of Jose de Dios; on the SW., by a Barrio Road; and on the NW., by property of the Heirs of Basilio de Dios. Point "1" is N. 43 deg. 05 min. W., 741.80 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 377-D, Santa Rita Cadastre. Area five hundred seventeen (517) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at Branch II, Gusali ng Katarungan, Cervantes Subdivision, in the Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philip-

pires, on the 29th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Presiding Judge of said Court, the 4th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA
Land Registration Case No. N-7

LRC Record No. N-46911

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, and the Municipal Council, Guagua, Pampanga; Carmen Castañeda, San Roque, Guagua, Pampanga; Gerarda Lopez Vda. de Vitug, San Nicolas 2.0 Guagua, Pampanga; Apolonio Alfonso Gaza and Mariano de Jesus, Betis, Guagua, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Benjamin L. Vitug, San Roque, Guagua, Pampanga, assisted by Atty. Juan C. Limin, Guagua, Pampanga, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 5043, Cad. 376-D, Guagua Cadastre, plan As-1814), situated in the Barrio of San Juan Bautista, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the NE. by property of Apolonio Alfonso Gaza; on the SE., by the Betis River; on the SW., by property of Mariano de Jesus; and on the NW., by the Pro-

vincial Road. Point "1" is N. 27 deg. 47 min. E., 671.23 meters from BILM 1, Cad-376-D, Guagua Cadastre. Area five hundred eighty-seven (587) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at Branch II, Gusaling Katarungan, Cervantes Subdivision, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on the 22nd day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Judge of said Court, the 4th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA

Land Registration Case No. N-8
LRC Record No. N-46912

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Guagua, Pampanga; Maria Sibug, Juana Sibug, Liberato Sibug, Luciano Sibug, Melchor Sibug, Gorgonia Sibug, Jesus Sibug, Sta. Ines, Guagua, Pampanga; Mateo Manabat, Heirs of Benito Ocampo and Juan Sibug, Sta. Ines, Betis, Guagua, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Jose Y. Sibug, Sta. Ines, Betis, Guagua, Pampanga, thru Atty. Aurelio D. Songco,

Guagua, Pampanga, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 3732, Cad-376-D, Guagua Cadastre, plan As-03-000211), situated in the Barrio of Sta. Ines, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the NE., by a Barrio Road; on the SE., by property of Juan Sibug; on the SW., by property of the Heirs of Benito Ocampo; and on the NW., by property of Mateo Manabat. Point "1" is N. 56 deg. 33 min. E., 2,872.69 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 376-D, Guagua Cadastre. Area seven hundred fifty one (751) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at Branch II, Gusaling Katarungan, Cervantes Subdivision, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on the 29th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Presiding Judge of said Court, the 4th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.

Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

[19, 20]

Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA

Land Registration Case No. N-1116

LRC Record No. N-46980

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Heirs of Agapito Laxa, Antonia G. Umlas, Jose Laxamana, Crispina Laxamana, Vda. de Baltazar, Leo-

nida Vda. de Laki, Heirs of Andres dela Cruz, Heirs of Juan Manuel, San Nicolas 1st, Sexmoan, Pampanga; Modesto Cabrera, Vicente Catalino, Catalino Vicente, % Amado Vicente, Sto. Tomas, Pampanga; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Mariano L. Baltazar, San Nicolas 1st, Sexmoan, Pampanga, to register and confirm his title to the following properties:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1422, Cad-306-D, Sexmoan Cadastre, plan Ap-24230), with the building and improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of San Antonio, Municipality of Sexmoan, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the N. and NW. by the Sanda River; on the NE. and SE. by property of Modesto Cabrera; and on the SW. by property of Jose Laxamana. Point "1" is S. 16 deg. 08 min. W., 4,522.80 meters from BLLM 1, Cad-306-D, Sexmoan Cadastre. Area forty-two thousand nine hundred twenty (42,920) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 170, Cad-306-D, Sexmoan Cadastre, plan Ap-25118), situated in the Barrios of Sta. Lucia & San Nicolas 1st, Municipality of Sexmoan, Province of Pampanga. Bounded on the NE. by property of Agapito Laxa; on the SE. by the Sexmoan River; on the SW. by property of Juan Manuel; and on the NW. by a Barrio Road. Point "1" is N. 7 deg. 29 min. W., 417.33 meters from BLLM 1, Cad-306-D, Sexmoan Cadastre. Area five hundred thirty-three (533) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at Branch II, Cervantes Subdivision, Municipality of Guagua, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on the 29th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe V. Buencamino, Presiding Judge of said Court, the 28th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 30th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.

Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO

[19, 20]

Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA

Land Registration Case No. N-1203
LRC Record No. N-46981

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, and the District Land Office No. III-1, San Fernando, Pampanga; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Minalin, Pampanga; Alfredo Garcia, Bernabe Figueroa, Heirs of Victor Figueroa, Dominador Canlas and Segundo Tongol, Sto. Rosario, Minalin, Pampanga; Aurelia de Leon, Block 4, Sto. Cristo, Tarlac, Tarlac; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Francisco F. Mandap, Virginia Mandap and Carlos Mandap, Block 4, Sto. Cristo, Tarlac, Tarlac, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

Two (2) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of Sto. Rosario, Municipality of Minalin, Province of Pampanga. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are as follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 299-Cad, 379-D, Minalin Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000538). Bounded on the NE. by property of the Heirs of Victor Figueroa; on the SE. by Lot 300; on the SW. by property of Segundo Tongol and on the NW. by Municipal Road. Point "1" is N. 64 deg. 34 min. E., 648.65 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 379-D Minalin Cadastre. Area one hundred fifty nine (159) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 300, Cad-379-D, Minalin Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000538). Bounded on the NE. by property of the Heirs of Victor Figueroa; on the SE. by property of Dominador Canlas; on the SW. by property of Segundo Tongol; and on the NW. by Lot 299. Point "1" is N. 64 deg. 34 min. E., 648.65 meters from BLLM 1, Cad-379-D, Minalin Cadastre. Area one hundred sixty one (161) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, at its session to be held at the Pampanga Hall of Justice, Municipality of San Fernando, Province of Pampanga, Philippines, on the 29th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show

cause if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Mariano C. Castañeda, Jr., Presiding Judge, Branch III of said Court, the 28th day of April, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 30th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF
PANGASINAN

Land Registration Case No. D-1435
LRC Record No. N-46863

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the 1st Pangasinan Highway District Engineer, Lingayen, Pangasinan; the District Land Office No. I-7, Dagupan City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Municipal Treasurer, Florencio Benito and Juan Fernandez, Sta. Barbara, Pangasinan; Cecelia Ballesteros, Francisco Macatlong, Gregorio Mariano and Protacio Garcia; Maningding, Sta. Barbara, Pangasinan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Spouses Teodoro Ballesteros and Jovita Samson, Barrio Patayac, Sta. Barbara, Pangasinan; represented by Roman V. Ballesteros, Dagupan City Post Office, Dagupan City; to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan-Psu-214474), situated in the Barrio of Maningding, Municipality of Sta. Barbara, Province of Pangasinan. Bounded on the NE., by a road and property of Juan Fernandez; on the SE., by property of Francisco Macatlong (before) Gregorio Mariano (now) on the SW., by properties of Florencio Benito and Protacio Garcia;

and on the NW., by the McArthur Highway to Urdaneta. Point "1" is S. 40 deg. 08 min. E. 574.01 meters from BLLM 2, Sta. Barbara, Pangasinan. Area one thousand two hundred forty-one (1,241) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pangasinan, at its session to be held in the City of Dagupan, Philippines, on the 28th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe P. De Vera, Executive Judge of said Court, the 19th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 14th day of April, 1975.

Attest: **GREGORIO BILOG, JR.**
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: **GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO**
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF
PANGASINAN

Land Registration Case No. D-1436
LRC Record No. N-46885

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the 1st Pangasinan Highway District Engineer, Lingayen, Pangasinan; the District Land Office No. I-7, Dagupan City; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Catalina Parajas, Eustaquio Legaspi, Angelo Bustillos, Anastacio Bustillos, Calasiao, Pangasinan; Ma. Nita F. Estrellas, Agnes S. Estrellas, Aurora Ramos, Binmaley, Pangasinan; Filomena Nepoles-Estrellas, Bued, Calasiao, Pangasinan; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Agripino A. Estrellas, Alex N. Estrellas, Philip N. Estrellas, Agripino N. Estrellas

Jr., Generosa N. Estrellas and Erlinda N. Estrellas, Binmaley Pangasinan; to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan-Psu-205741) situated in the Barrio of Bued, Municipality of Calasiao, Province of Pangasinan. Bounded on the N. and NW., by an Alley; on the E., by a Barrio Road; on the S. by properties of Catalina Parajas, Eustaquio Legaspi and Angelo Bustillos; and on the W. by property of Anastacio Bustillos. Point "1" is N. 66 deg. 13 min. E., 2,499.00 meters from BLLM 2, Calasiao, Pangasinan. Area eight thousand two hundred nineteen (8,219) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Pangasinan, at its session to be held in the City of Dagupan, Philippines, on the 9th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Felipe P. De Vera, Executive Judge of said Court, the 31st day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: **GREGORIO BILOG, JR.**
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: **GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO**
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF QUEZON

Land Registration Case No. N-990
LRC Record No. N-46782

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the District Land Office No. IV-3, Lucena City; the Municipal Mayor, and the Municipal Council, Tiaong, Quezon; Primitivo Untalan, Juana Vda. de Punzalan, Pascuala Millares, Donato Untavero, Severino Llanero and Camilo Recto, Barrio Quiopot.

Tiaong, Quezon; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Virginia Vda. de Dimaano, No. 4 Bansalangan St., Project 7, Quezon City; the Spouses Antonio Grey and Anastacia Ramos, Tiaong, Quezon; the spouses Benjamin Gregorio and Candida Velasquez, 45 Antique St., Bago Bantay, Quezon City; the Spouses Isagani Lacson and Esperanza Mendoza, 112 Quezon Boulevard Extension, Quezon City; assisted by Atty. Alberto Aguilar, 215 Shaw Boulevard, Mandaluyong, Rizal; to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan (LRC) Psu-484), with the improvements thereon, situated in the Barrio of Quipot & Bula, Municipality of Tiaong, Province of Quezon. Bounded on the N., by property of Primitivo Untalan; on the NE., by the Tamisan creek and Public Land; on the S., by Cababayag creek; on the SW., by properties of Camilo Recto and Pascuala Millares, et. al; and on the NW., by Sapang Galang property of Juana Vda. de Punzalan. Point "1" is S. 21 deg. 27 min. W., 2,668.70 meters from BLLM 1, Tiaong Quezon. Area four hundred five thousand seven hundred sixty seven (405,767) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Quezon, at its session to be held in the City of Lucena, Philippines, on the 17th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Leodegario L. Magol, Judge of said Court, the 10th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL
Land Registration Case No. N-8723
LRC Record No. N-46667

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the

District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano Street, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Pasig, Rizal; Isidro Omana, Quiterio Lorenzo, Carlos N. Francisco, Ciriaco or Ciriaca Bugnot, Teofilo Bugnot, Jose Conducto and Emiliano Caruncho, Kapasigan, Pasig, Rizal; Maximo Flores and Petra Raymundo, Bigasan, Kapasigan, Pasig, Rizal; and Carlos Victorino, Sixto Antonio Avenue, Caniogan, Pasig, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the spouses Jose Mendiola and Fermina Flores, 177 Sta. Ana, Taguig, Rizal, thru Atty. Norberto L. Inlayo, Dela Virgen Street, Antipolo, Rizal, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-04-000518), situated in the Barrio of Caniogan, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N., by Ligaya Street; on the E., by the Municipal Road; on the SE., by property of Carlos Victorino; and on the W., by Lot 2. Point "1" is N. 1 deg. 33 min. W., 768.72 meters from BLLM 1, Pasig, Rizal. Area two hundred fifty six (256) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-04-000518), situated in the Barrio of Caniogan, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the E., by Lot 1; on the S., by property of Carlos Victorino; on the W., and NW., by Dr. Sixto Antonio Avenue. Point "1" is N. 1 deg. 33 min. W., 768.72 meters from BLLM 1, Pasig, Rizal. Area thirty eight (38) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (plan Psu-37520), situated in the Barrio of Capasigan, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N., by property of Isidro Omana; on the NE., by properties of Quiterio Lorenzo claimed by Emiliano Caruncho and Carlos N. Francisco; on the S., by properties of Ciriaca or Ciriaco and Teofila Bugnot; and on the NW., by A. Mabini Street. Point "1" is N. 3 deg. 28 min. W., 658.56 meters from BLLM 1, Pasig, Rizal. Area seven hundred thirty four (734) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 2nd day of September, 1975,

at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Ricardo L. Pronove, Jr. Judge of said Court, the 26th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8721
LRC Record No. N-46694

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757, Solano Street, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, the Manager, Eulogio Rodriguez Rural Bank and the General Manager, C & C Commercial, Taguig, Rizal; Pablo Velasco, Tomas Licsi, Antonio San Pedro, Bernardo Martinez, Crispin Martin and Juanita Martin, Palatiw, Pasig, Rizal; Manuel Tatco, Malinao, Pasig, Rizal; Gregorio Natividad, Estela Balderrama, Felipe Rayos del Sol, Angel Rayos, Fortunato Dinguibayan, Gregorio Esguerra, Eugenia Mendoza, Feliciano Pagkalinawan and Simplicio Ordoñez, Tipas, Taguig, Rizal; and Carmelita K. Roxas, No. 580 E. Cornejo Street, Malibay, Pasay City; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Augusto V. Natividad, No. 580 E. Cornejo Street, Malibay, Pasay City, to register and confirm his title to the following properties:

1. A parcel of land (plan Psu-176233), situated in the Barrio of Napindan, Municipality of Taguig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N., and NE., by properties of Pablo Velasco and Tomas Licsi and Bernardo Martinez and children; on the E., and SE., by property of Manuel Tatco; on the SW., by property of Gregorio Natividad; and on the NW., by the Pasig, River. Point "1" is N. 56 deg. 56 min. E., 2,862.20 meters from BLLM 1, Taguig, Rizal. Area thirteen thousand six hundred twenty one (13,621) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (plan Psu-176235), situated in the Sitio of Sukol, Barrio of Napindan, Municipality of Taguig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N. by property of Estela Balderrama; on the E., by an irrigation ditch and beyond by property of C & C Commercial; on the SE., by property of Angel Rayos; and on the W., by property of Felipe Rayos del Sol. Point "1" is N. 48 deg. 18 min. E., 2,495.28 meters from BLLM 1, Taguig, Rizal. Area two thousand nine hundred fifty-four (2,954) square meters, more or less.

3. A parcel of land (plan Psu-176236), situated in the Sitio of Ibayo, Barrio of Tipas, Municipality of Taguig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the NE., by property of Eugenia Mendoza; on the SE., by property of Feliciano Pagkalinawan; on the SW., by property of Simplicio Ordoñez; and on the NW., by property of Fortunato Dinguibayan and Gregorio Esguerra. Point "1" is N. 43 deg. 20 min. E., 2,061.28 meters from BLLM 1, Taguig, Rizal. Area four thousand three hundred forty three (4,343) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held at the Hall of Justice, Provincial Capitol Compound, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 14th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Emilio V. Salas, Presiding Judge Branch I of said Court, the 5th day of May, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 30th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8741
LRC Record No. N-46725

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-I, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, and the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Cainta, Rizal; Marcial Suarez, Delfin C. Cruz, Josefina D. Caluag, Victorio Buenviaje, San Andres, Cainta, Rizal; Ignacio Tuico, Melania Principe, Francisco Raymundo, Maximo or Maxima Tuico, Maxime Jabson % Rizal Angeles and Crisanta J. Cruz, % Rizal Angeles, Lopez Jaena St., Wawa, Pasig, Rizal; Arcadio Raymundo, M.H. del Pilar St., Palatiw, Pasig, Rizal; Sergio Makalinaw and Maria Angeles, Blumentrit St., Capasigan, Pasig, Rizal; Paz Casanova, Gerardo dela Cruz, and Pablo Sta. Ana, San Miguel, Pasig, Rizal; and Elpidio Santos, Palatiw, Pasig, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Realty Development Corporation, 250-P. Casal, San Miguel, Manila; Alfredo Buenviaje and Felisa Buenviaje, Cristeta Buenviaje, San Miguel, Pasig, Rizal; Sixto Buenviaje, Sto. Tomas, Pasig, Rizal; and Lapaz Buenviaje, Palatiw, Pasig, Rizal; thru Atty. Magpuri C. Jabson, 25 P. Burgos, Pasig, Rizal, to register and confirm their title to the following properties:

TWO (2) parcels of land situated in the Barrio of San Andres, Municipality of Cainta, Province of Rizal. The boundaries and areas of said parcels are follows:

1. A parcel of land (Lot 1, Plan Psu-04-000902). Bounded on the N. by property of Sergio Makalinaw and Maria Angeles (before) Arcadio Raymundo (now); on the E. and S. by property of Ignacio Tuico and Melania Principe; and on the SW. by Irrigation Ditch and beyond property of Realty Development Corporation. Point "1" is N. 72 deg. 02 min. E., 2,665.81 meters from BLLM 1, Pasig, Rizal. Area three thousand six hundred three (3,603) square meters, more or less.

2. A parcel of land (Lot 2, plan Psu-04-000902). Bounded on the N. by property of Francisco Raymundo and Maximo or Maxima Tuico; on the E. by property of Maximo Jabson and Crisanta J. Cruz; on the SW. by properties of Marcial Suarez, Ignacio Tuico and Melania Principe; and on the W. by property of Sergio Makalinaw and Maria Angeles (before) Arcadio Raymundo (now). Point "1" is N. 73 deg. 06 min. E., 2,815.61 meters from BLLM 1, Pasig, Rizal. Area ten thousand four hundred four (10,404) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held at the Second Floor Justice Hall Building Capitol Compound, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 29th day of July, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Nicanor S. Sison, Judge Branch XXII of said Court, the 25th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 30th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. C-250
LRC Record No. N-46739

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer and the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; Maria Marina de Silva, Rufina and Company, Leonardo de Silva and Teofilo de Silva,

Tonsuya, Malabon, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Nemensio de Silva, Jr., Isagani de Silva, Luningning de Silva, Elena de Silva, Rosalinda de Silva, Job de Silva, Rebecca de Silva, Abel de Silva, Sarah de Silva, Mahinhin de Silva and Mayumi de Silva, Tonsuya, Malabon, Rizal; thru Atty. Jose A. Esquerro, 686-C Cavite St., Tondo, Manila; to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1, plan Psu-147316 Amd), situated in the Barrio of Tonsuya, Municipality of Malabon, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N. by Lot 3, property of Maria Marina de Silva and Lot 4, property of Leonardo de Silva; on the E., by Lot 4, property of Leonardo de Silva; on the S., by Lot 5; and on the W., by Lot 2, property of Teofilo de Silva. Point "1" is N. 69 deg. 01 min. E., 662.91 meters from BLLM 1, Malabon, Rizal. Area one hundred twenty five (125) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the City of Caloocan, Philippines, on the 15th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Manuel A. Argel, Judge of said Court, the 12th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19,20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8036
LRC Recerd No. N-46802

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-I, 757 Gen. Solano, Street, San Miguel, Manila; the President Philippines Share Corporation, B.F. Condominium, Aduana Street Intramuros, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development,

Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, and the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig, Rizal; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Las Piñas, Rizal; Segundo Gervacio, Zapote, Bacoor, Cavite; the Heirs of Basilio Trinidad, Enrique M. Almario, Bibiana Presentacion, Francisco Pagtakhan and Catalino Ramos, Pamplona, Las Piñas, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by the Heirs of Eugenio Trinidad, Maria G. Trinidad, Candido Trinidad, Claudia Trinidad, Gertrudes Trinidad, Pamplona, Las Piñas, Rizal, to register and confirm their title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-252506), situated in the Sitio of Paso ni Lucas, Barrio of Pamplona, Municipality of Las Piñas, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N. and NE., by property of Segundo Gervacio (before) Philippines Share Corporation (now) on the SE., by property of the Heirs of Basilio Trinidad (before) Philippines Share Corporation (now); and on the SW., by the Zapote River; Point "1" is S. 27 deg. 53 min. E., 3,264.53 meters from BLBM 1, Pamplona, Las Piñas, Rizal. Area one thousand one hundred ninety nine (1,199) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 29th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Carolina C. Griño-Aquino, Judge of said Court, the 5th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19,20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. C-238
LRC Record No. N-46903

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-1, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, Pasig Rizal; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Malabon, Rizal, Teodomiro Manapat, Simeon Dungao, Leonardo Lazaro and Serapia Santos, Gen. Borromeo St., Longos, Malabon, Rizal; Maria Cruz Vda. de Aquino, Cayetano Cruz and Paz Cruz, Hulo, Malabon, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Olimpia Manapat, Gen. Borromeo St. Longos, Malabon, Rizal, assisted by Atty. Fernando V. Domingo, Hulo, Malabon, Rizal; to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan-Psu-239822) situated in the Barrio of Tonsuya, Municipality of Malabon, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N. by property of Teodomiro Manapat; on the E., by property of Simeon Dungao; on the S., by a Callejon and property of Leonardo Lazaro & Serapia Santos; and on the W., by a Borromeo Street. Point "1" is N. 73 deg. 44 min. E. 591.94 meters from BLBM 1, Malabon, Rizal. Area two hundred eight (208) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the City of Calocan, Philippines, on the 15th day of August, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Serafin Salvador, Judge of said Court, the 10th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest:

GREGORIO BILOG, Jr.
Commissioner of Land Registration

By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF RIZAL

Land Registration Case No. N-8751
LRC Record No. N-46936

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the District Land Office No. IV-I, 757 Gen. Solano, San Miguel, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, the General Manager, Laguna Lake Development Authority, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Pasig, Rizal; Florentina Banaag, Felicidad Gona, Cayetano San Agustin, Dionisia San Agustin, Evaristo Gutierrez, Pedro Lopena, Rosario, Pasig, Rizal; Vicente Gomez, Sto. Niño, Marikina, Rizal; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Juanita Jabson, Bambang, Pasig, Rizal, to register and confirm her title to the following property:

A parcel of land (plan Psu-04-000552), situated in the Barrio of Rosario, Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal. Bounded on the N. by properties of Pedro Lopena and Florentina Banaag; on the NE. by property of Felicidad Gona; on the E. by property of Cayetano & Dionisia San Agustin (before) Liamson Subdivision (now); on the S. by property of Evaristo Gutierrez; on the SW. by property of Vicente Gomez; and on the W. by a Creek. Point "1" is S. 43 deg. 19 min. W., 368.84 meters from BLBM 2, Rosario, Pasig, Rizal. Area twenty five thousand seven hundred twenty-six (25,726) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Rizal, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Pasig, Province of Rizal, Philippines, on the 18th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded

and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Pedro C. Navarro, Judge of said Court, the 17th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 30th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF ZAMBALES

Land Registration Case No. N-O-132

LRC Record No. N-46559

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Iba, Zambales; the District Land Office No. III-4, the Municipal Mayor, the Municipal Council, Jesus F. Magsaysay, Ignacio Gallardo, Manuel Espiritu, Castillejos, Zambales; Alejo Enriquez, Alosies, Castillejos, Zambales; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Jessmag Incorporated represented by Aniceta S. Pingol 17th Floor Ramon Magsaysay Center, Roxas Boulevard, Manila, assisted by Atty. Antonio P. Cacho, Iba, Zambales, to register and confirm its title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 1568, Cad-322-D, Castillejos Cadastre-plan AP-03-000805), situated in the Barrio of Alosies, Municipality of Castillejos Province of Zambales. Bounded on the N. and E., by Roads; on the SW., by Lot 1567 by Public Land and on the W., by Lots 1565 and 1566, Public Land. Point "1" is S. 58 deg. 02 min. W., 2,387.22 meters from BLLM 1, Castillejos Cadastre. Area one hundred eighteen thousand seven hundred seventy-three (118,773) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Zambales, at its session to be held in the City of Olongapo, Philippines, on the 2nd day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid your default will be recorded and the said applica-

tion will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Augusto M. Amores, Judge of said Court, the 7th day of March, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
Acting Chief, Docket Division
[19, 20]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF ZAMBALES

Land Registration Case No. N-111-I

LRC Record No. N-46874

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Iba, Zambales; the District Land Office No. III-4, the Director, Bureau of Lands, Olongapo City; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Botolan, Zambales; Emilio Kolellon, Baldomero Flores, Morasa, Botolan, Zambales; the Heirs of Felipe Tiglaol, Macabebe, Pampanga; the Heirs of Mateo Encarnacion, San Nicolas, San Fernando, Pampanga; Maria Pineda, Molave Road, L. & S. Subdivision, Angeles City; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Eusebio Nunag, 7 Molave Road, L & S Subdivision, Angeles City; assisted by Atty. Dionisio D. Dizon, Botolan, Zambales, to register and confirm his title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 879, Pls-467-D, Botolan Public Land Subdivision plan AP-03-000737), situated in the Barrio of Moras, Municipality of Botolan, Province of Zambales. Bounded on the SE., by the Unclassified Public Forest; on the W., by Lot 878 Public Land; on the NW., by Lot 880, property of Baldomero Flores. Point "1" is S. 58 deg. 13 min. E., 27,585.00 meters from BLLM 1, Pls-467-D, Botolan Public Land Subdivision. Area three hundred fifteen thousand nine hundred fifty-four (315,954) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Zambales, at its session to be held in the Municipality of Iba, Province of Zambales, Philippines, on the 15th day of September,

1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Antonio Q. Malaya, Judge of said Court, the 25th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 21st day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF ZAMBALES

Land Registration Case No. N-112-I
LRC Record No. N-46875

NOTICE OF INITIAL HEARING

To the Solicitor General, the Director of Lands, the Director of Public Works, Manila; the Director, Bureau of Forest Development, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City; the Hon. Secretary, Department of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City; the Provincial Governor, the Provincial Fiscal, the Provincial Treasurer, the Provincial Engineer, the Public Works District Engineer, the Highway District Engineer, Iba, Zambales; the District Land Office No. III-4, Olongapo City; the Municipal Mayor and the Municipal Council, Sta. Cruz, Zambales; Mariano Perolino, Esteban Misa, Mariano Ferroleno, Sabina Minimo and the Heirs of Igmidio Mina, Poblacion, Santa Cruz, Zambales; and to all whom it may concern:

Whereas, an application has been presented to this Court by Iglesia Ni Cristo, represented by Eraño G. Manalo, Executive Minister and Administrator, corner Central and Commonwealth Avenues, Diliman, Quezon City; thru Tafalla, Cruz & Associates, by Atty. Felix Gagarin, Central & Commonwealth Avenues, Diliman, Quezon City, to register and confirm its title to the following property:

A parcel of land (Lot 7, Cad. 316-D, Sta. Cruz Cadastre, plan Ap-03-000788), situated in the Poblacion, Municipality of Sta. Cruz, Province of Zambales. Bounded on the N., by property of Esteban Misa; on the NE., by property of Sabina Minimo; on the SE., by Misola Street; and on the W., by property of Mariano Ferroleno. Point "1" is N. 79 deg. 08 min. W., 196.33 meters from BLLM 1, Cad. 316-D, Santa Cruz Cadastre. Area two hundred fifty-nine (259) square meters, more or less.

You are hereby cited to appear before the Court of First Instance of Zambales, at its session to be held at Branch II, Municipality of Iba, Province of Zambales, Philippines, on the 16th day of September, 1975, at 8:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to show cause, if any you have, why the prayer of said application shall not be granted; and unless you appear at the time and place aforesaid, your default will be recorded and the said application will be taken as confessed and you will be forever barred from contesting said application or any decree entered thereon.

Witness, the Hon. Antonio Q. Malaya, Judge of said Court, the 18th day of February, in the year 1975.

Issued at Quezon City, Philippines, this 28th day of April, 1975.

Attest: GREGORIO BILOG, JR.
Commissioner of Land Registration
By: GREGORIO C. SEMBRANO
[19, 20] Acting Chief, Docket Division

Kawanihan ng mga Lupain (BUREAU OF LANDS)

[LAST PUBLICATION]

LEASE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Notice is hereby given that the Bureau of Lands at Roxas City will auction through oral bidding at 10:00 A.M. on June 2, 1975 the right to lease for commercial purposes the tract of land hereinbelow described. Written bids in the prescribed form must be submitted not later than 10:00 A.M. on the said date.

Location: Libas, Roxas City

Description: Mli-06-02-000025-D

Area: 1,000 square meters

Appraised value of land: ₱10.00 per square meter

Appraised value of existing improvements: None.

Appraised value of proposed improvements: ₱10,000.00

Applied for by: AGNES E. BASA—M.L.A. No. (VI-2)25

The right to lease the land will be awarded to the person offering the highest annual rental, which shall not be less than three per centum

(3%) of the value of the land plus one per centum (1%) of the value of the proposed and/or existing improvements. In order that a person may be entitled to participate in the bidding, he must be a qualified lease applicant, and must, before the commencement of the same, make a deposit equivalent to at least three (3) months' rental. Only deposits in cash, money order, treasury warrant, certified check, cashier's check or manager's check shall be accepted. A person bidding in representation of another may do so under a duly executed power of attorney. During the bidding, the bidder has to make an additional deposit every time his bid is raised, to complete the three (3) months' rental; otherwise, such bid as raised shall not be accepted. The right is reserved to reject any or all bids.

The successful bidder if other than the applicant must reimburse the latter of the expenses for the publication of the notice of auction and the survey of the land.

Manila, March 20, 1975

[15-20]

RAMON N. CASANOVA

Director of Lands

Lupon ng Pamumuhunan
(BOARD OF INVESTMENTS)**[SECOND PUBLICATION]**

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, LIBERTAD TE LEE, a citizen of the Republic of China, with business address at Quezon Street, Sorsogon, Sorsogon, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for a license to engage in the wholesale of dry goods, paper and plastic products, umbrellas, school and travelling bags and shoes in Sorsogon, Sorsogon. The business is capitalized at P31,265.60, Philippine currency.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That applicant shall not sell at retail the aforementioned products;
- 2) That in case she wishes to continue the peddling of her goods to the neighboring towns of Irosin, Juban, Gubat and Casiguran, she should secure prior approval from the Board; and
- 3) That she shall submit an annual report of her business activities (using BOI Form No. 5032) on or before March 31 of each year.

April 8, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.
[19-21] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, Go TIAN PUN, a citizen of the Republic of China, with office address at Dakudao Bldg., San Pedro St., Davao City, has filed with the Board of Investments an application

for a license to continue to operate Hotel Amigos as a single proprietorship said hotel having been previously owned by a partnership which had been dissolved on December 4, 1974. The business is capitalized at P25,000.00, Philippine currency.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That applicant will continue to operate the hotel as a single proprietorship;
- 2) That applicant shall not expand into another line of business activity without prior BOI approval; and
- 3) That it shall submit an annual report of its business activities (using BOI Form No. 5032) on or before March 31 of each year.

March 25, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.
[19-21] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 3 of Republic Act No. 5455 and Section 2, Rule III, of the Basic Rules and Regulations to Implement the Intent and Provisions of the said Act, MANILA MANDARIN HOTEL, INC., a corporation existing under the laws of the Philippines, and with business address at % Jardine Davies, Inc., Buendia Avenue, Makati, Rizal and engaged in hotel business has filed with the Board of Investments an application to accept the permissible investment of The Hongkong Land Co. Ltd. and Jardine Davies, Inc., in the amount of P3,750,000.00 and P990,000.00, Philippine currency, respectively.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and

regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant shall submit the required proof of reciprocity for and in behalf of the foreign investors;
- 2) That it shall comply with the rules and regulations of the Philippine Tourism Authority with respect to its hotel operations and activities;

- 3 That it shall not accept additional foreign investments without securing prior authority from the Board of Investments; and
- 4) That it shall submit an annual report of its business activities (using BOI Form No. 5032) on or before March 31 of each year.

April 28, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.
[19-21] Board Secretary

Lupon ng Pamumuhunan (BOARD OF INVESTMENTS)

[LAST PUBLICATION]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 3 of Republic Act No. 5455 and Section 3, Rule III, of the Basic Rules and Regulations to Implement the Intent and Provisions of the said Act, BASIC PETROLEUM & MINERALS, INC., an existing domestic corporation, with business address at Suite 700, 7th Floor, Sarmiento Building, Ayala Avenue, Makati, Rizal, and engaged in the mining and oil exploration activities, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for advance authority to accept foreign investments in the total amount of P16 million or 40% of its authorized capital stock of P40 million.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That it will submit proof of reciprocity for and in behalf of its foreign investors if any single alien investor shall have direct investments exceeding 30%
- 2) That the percentage of its foreign equity shall not at any time exceed 40% of its authorized capital. However, this authority shall be subject to the Presidential directive and implementing regulation covering natural resource industries where the equity holdings of aliens maybe limited to a ratio lower than 40%, whenever applicable;
- 3) That it will not expand into another line of business activities without prior BOI authority; and
- 4) That it will submit semestral report on December 31 and another on June 30 of its sales of Class B shares and annual report of its business activities (using BOI Form No. 5032) on or before March 31 of each year.

March 26, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.,
[18-20] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, DY BUN GOK, a citizen of the Republic of China, with office address at 96 R. Magsaysay Avenue, Sta. Ana, Davao City, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for a license to engage in the grinding and milling of corn grain peelings and corn "binlid" into starch (gaw-gaw) in Davao City. The business is capitalized at P20,000.00, Philippine currency.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the condition that he shall submit an annual report of his business activities on or before March 31 of each year.

March 3, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.,
[18-20] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, TIU FAN SUY, a citizen of the Republic of China, with office address at 670 Ongpin St., Manila, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for a license to engage in the Chinese drug store business. The business is capitalized at P39,631.61, Philippine currency, and is actually a continuation of an existing business licensed under the name of his sister, Tiu Bon Hua.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and

regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That applicant shall only stock and sell Chinese drugs and medicines; and
- 2) That applicant shall submit an annual report of his business activities on or before March 31 of each year using the prescribed BOI Form No. 5032.

April 16, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.,
[18-20] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 3 of Republic Act No. 5455 and Section 2, Rule III, of the Basic Rules and Regulations to Implement the Intent and Provisions of the said Act, HOCHMETALS PHILIPPINES, INC., a corporation existing under the laws of the Philippines, with business address at Concorde Condominium, Legaspi Village, Makati, Rizal, and engaged in international brokerage for the sale of chemicals, minerals and investing in mining and industrial ventures, has filed with the Board of Investments an application to accept the permissible investment of Hochmetals Panama, S.A. in the total amount of P1,183,000.00, Philippine currency.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations subject, further, to the condition that it shall submit an annual report of its business activities (using BOI Form No. 5032) on or before March 31 of each year.

April 16, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.,
[18-20] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, MALAYSIAN AIRLINE

SYSTEM BERHAD, a firm existing under the laws of Malaysia, with office address at c/o Antonio Bengson III, Sol Bldg., Legaspi Village, Makati, Rizal, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for a license to engage in air transportation. The business is capitalized at P270 million, Philippine currency.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant shall comply with the rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration with respect to its operations;
- 2) That it shall maintain unimpaired in its Philippine office an amount equivalent to three (3) months operational expenses which shall be replenished if impaired by losses;
- 3) That it shall post a bond or bank guaranty in the sum of P100,000.00 to answer for its liabilities to resident creditors;
- 4) That the entry and employment of foreign personnel shall be subject to the immigration and labor laws and shall be strictly in accordance with the laws applicable to their profession;
- 5) That it shall submit the required proof of reciprocity; and
- 6) That it shall submit an annual report of its business activities on or before March 31 of each year.

March 14, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.,
[18-20] Board Secretary

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOARD OF INVESTMENTS
ORTIGAS BUILDING, ORTIGAS AVENUE
PASIG, RIZAL, PHILIPPINES D-721

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to Section 4 of Republic Act No. 5455, SO BUN PIN, a citizen of the Republic of China, with office address at 2199 F. B. Harrison St., Pasay City, has filed with the Board of Investments an application for a license to engage in the business of body repair of motor vehicles and welding shop in Pasay City. The business is capitalized at P5,000.00, Philippine currency.

This application shall be considered as approved and such approval shall be effective only after fifteen (15) days from the last date of publication and upon submission of proofs of publication of this notice and compliance with the other requirements of R.A. 5455 and its implementing rules and regulations. This is, further, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That applicant shall not expand into another business activity without prior BOI approval; and
- 2) That he shall submit an annual report of his business activities on or before March 31 of each year.

March 25, 1975, Pasig, Rizal, Philippines.

(Sgd.) ROBERTO C. CONCEPCION, JR.
[18-20] Board Secretary

PRICE LIST OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
(Now available at the Government Printing Office)

PHILIPPINE REPORTS

	Government Printing Office	By Mail		Government Printing Office	By Mail
Volume 75	P47.00	P49.85			
Volume 81	43.30	46.80	Volume IX—Containing Republic		
Volume 82	43.30	46.80	Acts Nos. 973-1201 (Paper		
Volume 84	47.00	49.80	Cover)	P11.00	P12.50
Volume 85	47.00	49.80	The above three volumes of		
Volume 86	36.10	39.05	Public Laws & Resolutions		
Volume 87	47.00	49.80	(Republic Acts Nos. 674-		
Volume 88	47.00	49.80	1201) (Cloth bound)	47.70	50.00
Volume 89	47.00	49.80	Volume X—Containing Republic		
Volume 90	54.20	57.40	Acts Nos. 1202-1411 (Paper		
Volume 91	55.90	58.65	cover)	11.00	12.50
Volume 92	57.75	60.70	Volume XI—Containing Republic		
Volume 93	67.15	69.15	Acts Nos. 1412-1612 (Paper		
Volume 94	67.15	69.15	cover)	11.00	12.50
Volume 95	59.55	61.75	Volume XII—Containing Republic		
Volume 96	60.65	62.85	Acts Nos. 1613-2049 (Paper		
Volume 97	64.95	67.10	cover)	11.50	12.50
Volume 98	64.95	67.10	The three above volumes of		
Volume 99	67.15	69.45	Public Laws & Resolutions		
Volume 100	67.15	69.45	(Republic Acts Nos. 1202-		
Volume 101	71.55	73.75	2049 combined in one book)		
Volume 102	64.95	67.10	(Cloth bound)	49.00	53.20
Volume 103	68.70	70.40	Volume XIII—Containing Republic		
Volume 104	68.70	70.40	Acts Nos. 2050-2093 (Paper		
Volume 105	77.15	79.20	cover)	7.25	9.85
Volume 106	77.75	81.50	Volume XIV—Containing Republic		
Volume 107	79.40	81.80	Acts Nos. 2094-2616 (Paper		
Volume 108	83.10	86.30	cover)	18.15	19.50
Volume 109	83.10	86.30	Volume XV—Containing Republic		
Volume 110	83.10	86.30	Acts Nos. 2617-3020 (Paper		
Volume 111	83.90	86.75	cover)	18.25	19.50
Volume 112	83.90	86.75	The above three volumes of		
Volume 113	83.90	86.75	Public Laws & Resolutions		
Volume 114	83.90	86.75	(Republic Acts Nos. 2030-		
			3020) combined in one book,		
			(Cloth bound)	70.35	74.80

LAWS AND RESOLUTIONS

Volume I—Containing Republic			Volume XVI—Containing Republic		
Acts Nos. 1-89 (Paper cover) ..	P13.40	P15.00	Acts Nos. 3451-3511 (Paper		
Volume II—Containing Republic			cover)	27.20	29.65
Acts Nos. 90-197 (Paper cover) ..	15.20	17.00	Volume XVII—Containing Republic		
The above three Volumes of			Acts Nos. 3021-3450 (Paper		
Public Laws & Resolutions			cover)	5.20	6.50
(Republic Acts Nos. 1-342)			Volume XVIII—Containing Republic		
combined in one book,			Acts Nos. 3513 to 3846		
(Cloth bound)			(Paper cover)	20.15	23.15
Volume IV—Containing Republic			The above three volumes of		
Acts Nos. 343-421 (Paper cover)	24.75	26.80	Public Laws & Resolutions		
Volume VI—Containing Republic			(Republic Acts Nos. 3021-		
Acts Nos. 591-673 (Paper cover)	7.45	9.20	3845) (Cloth Cover)	79.40	83.70
Volume VII—Containing Republic			Volume XIX—Containing Republic		
Acts Nos. 674-833 (Paper cover)	9.95	12.50	Acts Nos. 3847-4172 (Paper		
Volume VIII—Containing Republic			cover)	18.80	21.10
Acts Nos. 834-972 (Paper cover)	11.00	12.50	Volume XX—Containing Republic		
			Acts Nos. 4173-4641 (Paper		
			cover)	37.95	40.60

	Government Printing Office	By Mail		Government Printing Office	By Mail
CODE RULES					
Civil Code of the Philippines (Cloth bound)	₱18.15	₱19.50	Salary Data of the Philippines ..	₱8.05	9.20
Civil Code of the Philippines (Paper cover)	9.25	10.55	Forestry Administrative Order II (Revised)	2.70	3.85
Code of Crime (Paper cover) ..			Volume Table For Round Tim- ber—Bulletin No. 12		
Revised Penal Code (Paper cover)	5.15	7.50	Logarithmic Table (Extract from American Practical Navigator) ..	9.10	10.40
National Internal Revenue Code (As amended up to September 1969) (Paper cover)	19.40	25.20	REPUBLIC ACTS		
National Internal Revenue Code (Paper cover—Old)	16.30	18.60	No. 409 "Revised Charter of the City of Manila"	1.60	2.85
Revenue Regulations No. V-8-A Collection at Source of Income Tax on Wages	2.00	2.45	No. 509 "Price Administration Board"40	.60
Election Code of 1971, Republic Act No. 6388	3.90	5.90	No. 594 "Amendment to certain sections of the National Internal Revenue Code relating to priv- ilege taxes on business"75	1.05
Rules of Court in the Philippines Effective January 1, 1964	14.45	17.40	No. 602 "An Act to establish a Minimum Wage Law & other purposes"75	1.05
Rules of Practice in the Philippines Patent Office in Patents	6.40	8.15	No. 637 "Amendments to Patent Law"75	1.05
Rules of Practice in the Philippines Patent Office in Trademarks	4.95	6.10	No. 660 "Reorganizing the GSIS & providing for Retirement under the Pension Plan"75	1.05
Rules of Practice in the Philippines Patent Office in Copyrights	3.70	5.05	No. 800 "Amendment of Republic Act No. 307"75	1.05
MANUALS, SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS & OTHER PUBLICATIONS			No. 875 "An Act to promote In- dustrial Peace & for other pur- poses" (Magna Carta of Labor) ..	.75	1.05
Old or New Constitution of the Philippines	2.50	2.60	No. 897 "Amending Republic Act No. 304 (Back Pay Law)40	.65
Saligang Batas ng Pilipinas	2.75	3.30	No. 1355 "Laurel-Langley Agree- ment"	1.10	1.45
National Language—English Vo- cabulary	2.90	3.55	Compilation of Retirement Laws (Republic Acts Nos. 660, 1616, 4968, 5969)	2.60	3.65
Balarila ng Wikang Pambansa (Paper cover)	7.20	8.70	Compilation of Civil Service Laws (Republic Acts Nos. 2260, 6040 and Civil Service Rules)	3.90	5.95
Government Manual, 1950 (Paper cover)	10.95	12.25	Workmens Compensation Act No. 3428	2.35	4.30
Discursos de Malolos y Poesias Filipino en Español	10.10	10.95	No. 3512 "An Act creating a Fisheries Commission defining its powers, duties & etc.75	1.05
Filipinas Su Glorioso—Pasado	10.10	10.95	No. 3590—"Barrio Charter75	1.05
Auditing Requirement for Typical Government Disbursements	1.05	1.37	No. 3844 "Agricultural Land Reform Code	1.95	2.65
Revised Barrio Accounting System	1.89	2.35	No. 4119—"Workmens Compensa- tion Act (Amendment)55	1.05
National Accounting & Auditing Manual Volume I	8.05	9.55	No. 4136—"Land Transportation Commission (LTC)	1.45	1.75
National Accounting & Auditing Manual Volume II	14.45	15.95	No. 4670 "Magna Carta for Public School Teachers"55	1.00
National Accounting & Auditing Manual Volume III	5.35	6.50	No. 4864 "Police Act of 1969	1.45	1.75
Manual on Pre-Audit of Govern- ment Disbursement	4.35	5.15	No. 4968 "New Retirement Law"	.90	1.10
Appellate Courts Reports, Volume VIII (Cloth bound)	47.05	60.85			
Biografia de Rizal by Dr. Rafael Palma (Paper cover)	14.45	15.95			
Official Directory—1970	18.55	20.20			

REPUBLIC ACTS

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

	Government Printing Office	By Mail	Year	Volume	Number	
No. 5166 "Accountancy Act of 1967"90	1.20	1968	64	1, 3, to 20, 22 to 27	
No. 5185 "Decentralization Act of 1967"90	1.20	1969	65	33-35, 37, 39-40, 45-47, 51	
No. 5186 "Investment Incentives Act"	1.45	1.75	1970	66	1-14, 16-35, 39-52	
No. 5490 "Port Entry Mariveles Bataan"75	1.00	1971	67	1 to 52, 48 No stock	
No. 5969 "Amendatory Act applicable to former members of the GSIS who had retired on or before 1951"75	1.00	1972	68	1 to 52; 40, 41, 50, 52 No stock	
No. 6040 "An Act to amend certain section of R.A. No. 2260 known as Civil Service Act of 1959"75	1.00	1973	69	1 to 53	
No. 6110 "Omnibus Tax Law"	3.60	6.20	1974	70	1 to 52; 27 No stock	
No. 6111 "The Phil. Medicare Commission"80	1.05	1975	71	1 to present	
No. 6125 "Stabilization Tax on Consignments Abroad"80	1.05	NOTE: Latest Publications now available at the Government Printing Office, Port Area, Manila.			
No. 6126 "Regulate Rental for two (2) years etc."75	1.00	Published in the Official Gazette are Presidential Decrees, Letters of Instructions and General Orders beginning with Volume 68, Number 39 to date.			
No. 6129 "An Act amending further the Minimum Wage Law by increasing the minimum wage, establishing a Wage Commission, and for other purposes".	1.45	2.25	Separate reprints of the following Decrees are also available:—			
No. 6359 "An Act to regulate Rentals for two years"80	1.05			Government Printing Office	By Mail
No. 6361 "Creating the Price Control Council"	1.00	1.35	Presidential Decree No. 34, Revised Tariff and Customs Code		18.70	23.15
No. 6362 "Public School Teachers Salary Standardization Act"80	1.05	Presidential Decree No. 69 "Amending Certain Sections of the National Internal Revenue Code"		1.65	2.15
No. 6389 "Amendment of Rep. Act No. 3844"	1.45	2.25	Presidential Decree No. 71, Amending Rep. Act. No. 337 the General Banking Act55	.90
No. 6390 "To accelerate the Implementation of the Agrarian Reform Program Account Fund)"65	1.00	The Local Tax Code		2.75	8.30
No. 6414 "An Act increasing the minimum limit of Salaries of Municipal Officers"	1.00	1.35	Rules of Workmens Compensation Commission90	1.90
No. 6446 "RE-minimum and maximum salaries allowed for Civil Service eligible"40	.65	Presidential Decree No. 230 "Amending the Tariff and Custom Code; Creating Title III in Book 1—Export Tariff"35	.65
No. 6552 "Protection for Real Estate buyers"35	.65	Presidential Decree No. 442, New Labor Code of the Philippines with amendments		11.00	12.00
			Rules and Regulations implementing the Labor Code of the Philippines		14.20	15.20
			Compilation of Presidential Decrees, Letter of Instructions, General Orders & etc.: Volume I		—	—
			Driver's Manual		5.00	6.00

NOTE: Stocks & prices maybe changed from time to time.

Official Gazette



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The *Official Gazette* is published weekly—every Monday.

All articles and materials intended for the week must be received at the Government Printing Office not later than Tuesday morning.

The Editorial Office is located at the Presidential Press Staff, Department of Public Information, Malacañang.

ELPIDIO DE PERALTA, *Editor*

GENEROSO PAZ, *Senior Deskman*

The Publishing Office, which also attends to subscription, circulation, and claims, is the Government Printing Office at Boston Street, Port Area, Manila.

MANUEL L. AGUSTIN, *Director of Printing*

CHARITO A. MANGUBAT—*Acting Chief, Official Gazette Section*

TEL. NOS. 22-24-85 (GTS); 49-15-23; 43-31-29 (PLDT)

SUBSCRIPTION RATES EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1974

Subscription rates are for issues of the current year and the year immediately preceding. All other issues can be purchased as back numbers.

	Philippines	Foreign Countries (in U.S. dollars)
One Year	P96.00	\$60.00
Six Months	50.00	36.30
Three Months	27.00	25.00
Current number (per issue)	2.50	2.80
Back numbers (per issue)	3.00	3.50

Subscriptions are payable strictly in advance by certified check, official check, draft, Post Office money order, or cash in Philippines or United States currency and remitted to the Government Printing Office by registered mail. Stamps are not accepted in payment for subscription or advertisement.

All letters and payments of subscription should be addressed to the Director of Printing.

Claims for missing numbers must be made *immediately* upon receipt of the following number.

RATES OF PUBLICATION (As of August 1, 1974)

1. Trademarks with plate minimum of 10 square inches in one publication	P45.00
2. Notices pertaining to Dams in four publications	95.00
3. Notices pertaining to water rights in four publications	155.00
4. Notices of Hearing in Land Registration cases in two publications:	
a. For one lot	110.00
b. For every additional lot	30.00
5. Bureau of Lands Notices in six publications:	
a. For lease of Public Lands (one lot)	220.00
b. For sale of Public Lands (one lot)	180.00
c. For every additional lot leased or sold	75.00
6. All other publications of legal notices, patents, copyrights, invitation to bid; notices of application in mining leases, notices of application with the Board of Investments and other similar notices of advertisements:	
a. For the first publication per line	1.20
b. For each subsequent publication, per line65
7. Certificate of publication (true copy)	5.00